



# **Weather and Climate Inventory National Park Service Southwest Alaska Network**

**Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/SWAN/NRTR—2007/045**



**ON THE COVER**

Twin Lakes, Lake Clark National Park

Photograph copyrighted by the National Park Service

---

# **Weather and Climate Inventory**

## **National Park Service**

### **Southwest Alaska Network**

Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/SWAN/NRTR—2007/045  
WRCC Report 2007-20

Christopher A. Davey, Kelly T. Redmond, and David B. Simeral  
Western Regional Climate Center  
Desert Research Institute  
2215 Raggio Parkway  
Reno, Nevada 89512-1095

June 2007

U.S. Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
Natural Resource Program Center  
Fort Collins, Colorado

The Natural Resource Publication series addresses natural resource topics that are of interest and applicability to a broad readership in the National Park Service and to others in the management of natural resources, including the scientific community, the public, and the National Park Service conservation and environmental constituencies. Manuscripts are peer-reviewed to ensure that the information is scientifically credible, technically accurate, appropriately written for the intended audience, and designed and published in a professional manner.

The Natural Resources Technical Reports series is used to disseminate the peer-reviewed results of scientific studies in the physical, biological, and social sciences for both the advancement of science and the achievement of the National Park Service mission. The reports provide contributors with a forum for displaying comprehensive data that are often deleted from journals because of page limitations. Current examples of such reports include the results of research that address natural resource management issues; natural resource inventory and monitoring activities; resource assessment reports; scientific literature reviews; and peer-reviewed proceedings of technical workshops, conferences, or symposia.

Views and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect policies of the National Park Service. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use by the National Park Service.

Printed copies of reports in these series may be produced in a limited quantity and they are only available as long as the supply lasts. This report is also available from the Natural Resource Publications Management website (<http://www.nature.nps.gov/publications/NRPM>) on the Internet or by sending a request to the address on the back cover.

Please cite this publication as follows:

Davey, C. A., K. T. Redmond, and D. B. Simeral. 2007. Weather and Climate Inventory, National Park Service, Southwest Alaska Network. Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/SWAN/NRTR—2007/045. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

NPS/SWAN/NRTR—2007/045, June 2007

# Contents

	Page
Figures .....	v
Tables .....	vi
Appendixes .....	vii
Acronyms .....	viii
Executive Summary .....	x
Acknowledgements .....	xii
1.0. Introduction .....	1
1.1. Network Terminology .....	1
1.2. Weather versus Climate Definitions .....	2
1.3. Purpose of Measurements .....	4
1.4. Design of Climate-Monitoring Programs .....	4
2.0. Climate Background .....	9
2.1. Climate and the SWAN Environment .....	9
2.2. Spatial Variability .....	11
2.3. Temporal Variability .....	20
2.4. Parameter Regression on Independent Slopes Model .....	20
3.0. Methods .....	21
3.1. Metadata Retrieval .....	21
3.2. Criteria for Locating Stations .....	23
4.0. Station Inventory .....	24
4.1. Climate and Weather Networks .....	24
4.2. Station Locations .....	26

## Contents (continued)

	Page
5.0. Conclusions and Recommendations .....	36
5.1. Southwest Alaska Inventory and Monitoring Network .....	36
5.2. Spatial Variations in Mean Climate .....	36
5.3. Climate Change Detection .....	37
5.4. Aesthetics .....	38
5.5. Information Access .....	38
5.6. Summarized Conclusions and Recommendations .....	39
6.0. Literature Cited .....	40

# Figures

	Page
Figure 1.1. Map of the Southwest Alaska Network .....	3
Figure 2.1. Mean annual precipitation, 1961–1990, for the SWAN .....	13
Figure 2.2. Mean monthly precipitation at selected locations in the SWAN .....	14
Figure 2.3. Mean March precipitation, 1961–1990, for the SWAN .....	15
Figure 2.4. Mean September precipitation, 1961–1990, for the SWAN .....	16
Figure 2.5. Mean annual temperature, 1961–1990, for the SWAN .....	17
Figure 2.5. Mean January minimum temperature, 1961–1990, for the SWAN .....	18
Figure 2.6. Mean July maximum temperature, 1961–1990, for the SWAN .....	19
Figure 4.1. Station locations for SWAN park units .....	31
Figure 4.2. Station locations for ANIA .....	32
Figure 4.3. Station locations for KEFJ .....	34

## Tables

	Page
Table 1.1. Park units in the Southwest Alaska Network .....	2
Table 3.1. Primary metadata fields for SWAN weather and climate stations .....	22
Table 4.1. Weather and climate networks represented within the SWAN .....	24
Table 4.2. Number of stations within or nearby SWAN park units .....	26
Table 4.3. Weather and climate stations for SWAN park units .....	27

# Appendixes

	Page
Appendix A. Glossary .....	44
Appendix B. Climate-monitoring principles .....	46
Appendix C. Factors in operating a climate network .....	49
Appendix D. General design considerations for weather/climate-monitoring programs .....	52
Appendix E. Master metadata field list .....	72
Appendix F. Electronic supplements .....	74
Appendix G. Descriptions of weather/climate-monitoring networks .....	75

## Acronyms

AASC	American Association of State Climatologists
ACIS	Applied Climate Information System
ALAG	Alagnak Wild River
ANIA	Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve
ASOS	Automated Surface Observing System
AWOS	Automated Weather Observing System
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
COOP	Cooperative Observer Program
CRN	Climate Reference Network
CWOP	Citizen Weather Observer Program
DFIR	Double-Fence Intercomparison Reference
DST	daylight savings time
ENSO	El Niño Southern Oscillation
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standards
GMT	Greenwich Mean Time
GOES	Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite
GPS	Global Positioning System
I&M	NPS Inventory and Monitoring Program
KATM	Katmai National Park and Preserve
KEFJ	Kenai Fjords National Park and Preserve
LACL	Lake Clark National Park and Preserve
LST	local standard time
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NCDC	National Climatic Data Center
NetCDF	Network Common Data Form
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRCS-SC	NRCS snowcourse network
NWS	National Weather Service
PDO	Pacific Decadal Oscillation
PRISM	Parameter Regression on Independent Slopes Model
RAWS	Remote Automated Weather Station network
RCC	regional climate center
SAO	Surface Airways Observation network
SCAN	Soil Climate Analysis Network
SNOTEL	Snowfall Telemetry network
SOD	Summary Of the Day
Surfrad	Surface Radiation Budget network
SWAN	Southwest Alaska Inventory and Monitoring Network
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
UTC	Coordinated Universal Time

WBAN  
WMO  
WRCC

Weather Bureau Army Navy  
World Meteorological Organization  
Western Regional Climate Center

## Executive Summary

Climate is a dominant factor driving the physical and ecologic processes affecting the Southwest Alaska Inventory and Monitoring Network (SWAN). Climate patterns in SWAN are greatly influenced by the region's high latitude, proximity to oceans, complex topography, and the interaction of all these features with the global circulation. Wind, topography, and snowfall create a heterogeneous snow distribution that affects local biotic processes by determining water availability and growing season length. Changes in climate act as drivers of ecological change. At shorter time scales, the climate of the region is affected by primarily oceanic factors, such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) and the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO). Many climate models predict that future long-term climate changes will be greatest at high latitudes. Climate changes could accelerate ongoing glacier retreats and affect the distribution, abundance, growth, and productivity of plants and animals. Some animal populations may become isolated and unable to adapt to changing conditions, or they may shift ranges as the climate to which they are adapted effectively moves northward or to higher elevations. Alpine areas may decrease as montane tree species migrate upward. These climate changes also have a great influence on the peatlands found in some of the lowlands of SWAN park units. Because of its influence on the ecology of SWAN park units, climate was identified as a high-priority vital sign for SWAN and is one of the 12 basic inventories to be completed for all National Park Service (NPS) Inventory and Monitoring Program (I&M) networks.

This project was initiated to inventory past and present climate monitoring efforts in the SWAN. In this report, we provide the following information:

- Overview of broad-scale climatic factors and zones important to SWAN park units.
- Inventory of weather and climate station locations in and near SWAN park units relevant to the NPS I&M Program.
- Results of an inventory of metadata on each weather station, including affiliations for weather-monitoring networks, types of measurements recorded at these stations, and information about the actual measurements (length of record, etc.).
- Initial evaluation of the adequacy of coverage for existing weather stations and recommendations for improvements in monitoring weather and climate.

The climate of the SWAN region is heavily influenced by storms originating in the North Pacific and moving along a storm track that parallels the Aleutian chain. Storm frequency for the SWAN region is greatest during the late summer and early fall from August through October. The coastal SWAN park units have a maritime climate characterized by small temperature variations and abundant precipitation. Kenai Fjords National Park is the wettest of the parks, with mean annual precipitation in the maritime zone reaching 1500 cm. The remaining SWAN park units have wet coastal areas and drier interior areas. Interior locations of Lake Clark National Park and Preserve (LACL) receive 400 mm or less of precipitation each year. Mean annual temperatures are close to freezing for much of the SWAN. The interior is much colder than the coast in winter but warmer than the coast in summer. During the summer months, the coast-interior temperature gradient becomes less severe, due to the higher sun angle and longer days.

Through a search of national databases and inquiries to NPS staff, we have identified 17 weather and climate stations within SWAN park units. The most stations within park boundaries were found in LACL (9). Most of the weather and climate stations identified for SWAN park units had metadata and data records that are sufficiently complete and satisfactory in quality.

Recent reports on climate monitoring in the SWAN have pointed out the lack of weather and climate station coverage within large portions of SWAN park units and have noted candidate sites for new weather stations within the network. The SWAN network has taken the recommendations from some of these reports and, along with field reconnaissance trips in 2006 and additional input from the NWS office in Anchorage, has selected locations for weather station installations in both Katmai National Park and Preserve (KATM) and KEFJ. In KATM, seven on-site surveys and 10 aerial surveys were completed to identify candidate locations. The top three new KATM sites identified from the on-site surveys were 1) Coville, 2) Phaff, and 3) Contact Creek/Three Forks (tie). The top three new KATM sites identified from the aerial surveys were 1) Cape Gull, 2) Hallo Bay Lodge, and 3) Dark South/Swishak (tie). In KEFJ, seven on-site surveys were completed, with the top four new sites selected being 1) Yalik, 2) McArthur Pass, 3) Dinglstadt Glacier, and 4) Fire Cove. Station installations are planned at the above sites within the next year or two, pending the results of an environmental compliance evaluation which will investigate potential negative environmental impacts of these new station installations. Site surveys will also be conducted for LACL during the next year or two to identify suitable sites for weather station installations within that park unit. In all of these cases, the deciding factor for where to install new weather stations will center around site accessibility, as much of the terrain within SWAN parks is very remote. This factor, along with the severe climate conditions in SWAN, will create difficulties for maintaining new stations.

Despite the encouraging efforts to expand weather station coverage in park units such as KATM and LACL, it is not clear what climate monitoring efforts are planned for Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve (ANIA), based on recent reports from SWAN staff. There are very few climate stations in the SWAN having even moderately-long-term, homogeneous, complete, and reliable records. The difficulty of finding such stations within the SWAN underscores the necessity of maintaining observations at those long-term climate stations that are currently operating.

## **Acknowledgements**

This work was supported and completed under Task Agreement H8R07010001, with the Great Basin Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit. We would like to acknowledge very helpful assistance from various National Park Service personnel associated with the Southwest Alaska Inventory and Monitoring Network. Particular thanks are extended to Alan Bennett. We also thank John Gross, Margaret Beer, Grant Kelly, and Greg McCurdy for all their help. Portions of the work were supported by the NOAA Western Regional Climate Center.

## 1.0. Introduction

Weather and climate are key drivers in ecosystem structure and function. Global- and regional-scale climate variations will have a tremendous impact on natural systems (Chapin et al. 1996; Schlesinger 1997; Jacobson et al. 2000; Bonan 2002). Long-term patterns in temperature and precipitation provide first-order constraints on potential ecosystem structure and function. Secondary constraints are realized from the intensity and duration of individual weather events and, additionally, from seasonality and inter-annual climate variability. These constraints influence the fundamental properties of ecologic systems, such as soil–water relationships, plant–soil processes, and nutrient cycling, as well as disturbance rates and intensity. These properties, in turn, influence the life-history strategies supported by a climatic regime (Neilson 1987; Rodriguez-Iturbe 2000; Bennett et al. 2005).

Given the importance of climate, it is one of 12 basic inventories to be completed by the National Park Service (NPS) Inventory and Monitoring Program (I&M) network (I&M 2006). As primary environmental drivers for the other vital signs, weather and climate patterns present various practical and management consequences and implications for the NPS (Oakley et al. 2003). Most park units observe weather and climate elements as part of their overall mission. The lands under NPS stewardship provide many excellent locations for monitoring climatic conditions.

It is essential that park units within the Southwest Alaska Inventory and Monitoring Network (SWAN) have an effective climate-monitoring system in place to track climate changes and to aid in management decisions relating to these changes. The purpose of this report is to determine the current status of weather and climate monitoring within the SWAN (Table 1.1; Figure 1.1). In this report, we provide the following informational elements:

- Overview of broad-scale climatic factors and zones important to SWAN park units.
- Inventory of locations for all weather stations in and near SWAN park units that are relevant to the NPS I&M networks.
- Results of metadata inventory for each station, including weather-monitoring network affiliations, types of recorded measurements, and information about actual measurements (length of record, etc.).
- Initial evaluation of the adequacy of coverage for existing weather stations and recommendations for improvements in monitoring weather and climate.

The primary objectives of climate- and weather-monitoring activities in SWAN are as follows (Bennett et al. 2005):

- A. Understand the natural range of variation in weather patterns across the SWAN parks.
- B. Understand general climate trends in Network parks, including changes due to Pleistocene ice retreat and global climate change.

### 1.1. Network Terminology

Before proceeding, it is important to stress that this report discusses the idea of “networks” in two different ways. Modifiers are used to distinguish between NPS I&M networks and weather or climate station networks. See Appendix A for a full definition of these terms.

Table 1.1. Park units in the Southwest Alaska Network.

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Name</b>
ALAG	Alagnak Wild River
ANIA	Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve
KATM	Katmai National Park and Preserve
KEFJ	Kenai Fjords National Park
LACL	Lake Clark National Park and Preserve

### **1.1.1. Weather and climate Station Networks**

Most weather and climate measurements are made not from isolated stations but from stations that are part of a network operated in support of a particular mission. The limiting case is a network of one station, where measurements are made by an interested observer or group. Larger networks usually have additional inventory data and station-tracking procedures. Some national weather and climate networks are associated with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), including the National Weather Service (NWS) Cooperative Observer Program (COOP). Other national networks include the interagency Remote Automated Weather Station network (RAWS) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture/Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA/NRCS) Snowfall Telemetry (SNOTEL) and snowcourse networks. Usually a single agency, but sometimes a consortium of interested parties, will jointly support a particular weather/climate network.

### **1.1.2. NPS I&M Networks**

Within the NPS, the system for monitoring various attributes in the participating park units (about 270–280 in total) is divided into 32 NPS I&M networks. These networks are collections of park units grouped together around a common theme, typically geographical.

## **1.2. Weather versus Climate Definitions**

It is also important to distinguish whether the primary use of a given station is for weather purposes or for climate purposes. Weather station networks are intended for near-real-time usage, where the precise circumstances of a set of measurements are typically less important. In these cases, changes in exposure or other attributes over time are not as critical. Climate networks, however, are intended for long-term tracking of atmospheric conditions. Siting and exposure are critical factors for climate networks, and it is vitally important that the observational circumstances remain essentially unchanged over the duration of the station record.

Some climate networks can be considered hybrids of weather and climate networks. These hybrid climate networks can supply information on a short-term “weather” time scale and a longer-term “climate” time scale.

In this report, “weather” generally refers to current (or near-real-time) atmospheric conditions, while “climate” is defined as the complete ensemble of statistical descriptors for temporal and spatial properties of atmospheric behavior (see Appendix A). Climate and weather phenomena shade gradually into each other and are ultimately inseparable.



## Geographic Location - Southwest Alaska Network



Figure 1.1. Map of the Southwest Alaska Network.

### 1.3. Purpose of Measurements

Climate inventory and monitoring climate activities should be based on a set of guiding fundamental principles. Any evaluation of weather/climate monitoring programs begins with asking the following question:

- What is the purpose of weather and climate measurements?

Evaluation of past, present, or planned weather and climate monitoring activities must be based on the answer to this question.

Weather and climate data and information constitute a prominent and widely requested component of the NPS I&M networks (I&M 2006). Within the context of the NPS, the following services constitute the main purposes for recording weather and climate observations:

- Provide measurements for real-time operational needs and early warnings of potential hazards (landslides, mudflows, washouts, fallen trees, plowing activities, fire conditions, aircraft and watercraft conditions, road conditions, rescue conditions, fog, restoration and remediation activities, etc.).
- Provide visitor education and aid interpretation of expected and actual conditions for visitors while they are in the park and for deciding if and when to visit the park.
- Establish engineering and design criteria for structures, roads, culverts, etc., for human comfort, safety, and economic needs.
- Consistently monitor climate over the long-term to detect changes in environmental drivers affecting ecosystems, including both gradual and sudden events.
- Provide retrospective data to understand *a posteriori* changes in flora and fauna.
- Document for posterity the physical conditions in and near the park units, including mean, extreme, and variable measurements (in time and space) for all applications.

The last three items in the preceding list are pertinent primarily to the NPS I&M networks; however, all items are important to NPS operations and management. Most of the needs in this list overlap heavily. It is often impractical to operate separate climate measuring systems that also cannot be used to meet ordinary weather needs, where there is greater emphasis on timeliness and reliability.

### 1.4. Design of Climate-Monitoring Programs

Determining the purposes for collecting measurements in a given weather/climate monitoring program will guide the process of identifying weather and climate stations suitable for the monitoring program. The context for making these decisions is provided in Chapter 2 where background on the SWAN climate is presented. However, this process is only one step in evaluating and designing a climate-monitoring program. The following steps must also be included:

- Define park and network-specific monitoring needs and objectives.
- Identify locations and data repositories of existing and historic stations.
- Acquire existing data when necessary or practical.
- Evaluate the quality of existing data.

- Evaluate the adequacy of coverage of existing stations.
- Develop a protocol for monitoring the weather and climate, including the following:
  - Standardized summaries and reports of weather and climate data.
  - Data management (quality assurance and quality control, archiving, data access, etc.).
- Develop and implement a plan for installing or modifying stations, as necessary.

Throughout the design process, there are various factors that require consideration in evaluating weather and climate measurements. Many of these factors have been summarized by Dr. Tom Karl, director of the NOAA National Climatic Data Center (NCDC), and widely distributed as the “Ten Principles for Climate Monitoring” (Karl et al. 1996; NRC 2001). These principles are presented in Appendix B, and the guidelines are embodied in many of the comments made throughout this report. The most critical factors are presented here. In addition, an overview of requirements necessary to operate a climate network is provided in Appendix C, with further discussion in Appendix D.

#### **1.4.1. Need for Consistency**

A principal goal in climate monitoring is to detect and characterize slow and sudden changes in climate through time. This is of less concern for day-to-day weather changes, but it is of paramount importance for climate variability and change. There are many ways whereby changes in techniques for making measurements, changes in instruments or their exposures, or seemingly innocuous changes in site characteristics can lead to apparent changes in climate. Safeguards must be in place to avoid these false sources of temporal “climate” variability if we are to draw correct inferences about climate behavior over time from archived measurements.

For climate monitoring, consistency through time is vital, counting at least as important as absolute accuracy. Sensors record only what is occurring at the sensor—this is all they can detect. It is the responsibility of station or station network managers to ensure that observations are representative of the spatial and temporal climate scales that we wish to record.

#### **1.4.2. Metadata**

Changes in instruments, site characteristics, and observing methodologies can lead to apparent changes in climate through time. It is therefore vital to document all factors that can bear on the interpretation of climate measurements and to update the information repeatedly through time. This information (“metadata,” data about data) has its own history and set of quality-control issues that parallel those of the actual data. There is no single standard for the content of climate metadata, but a simple rule suffices:

- Observers should record all information that could be needed in the future to interpret observations correctly without benefit of the observers’ personal recollections.

Such documentation includes notes, drawings, site forms, and photos, which can be of inestimable value if taken in the correct manner. That stated, it is not always clear to the metadata provider *what is important* for posterity and *what will be important* in the future. It is almost impossible to “over document” a station. Station documentation is greatly underappreciated and is seldom thorough enough (especially for climate purposes). Insufficient

attention to this issue often lowers the present and especially future value of otherwise useful data.

The convention followed throughout climatology is to refer to metadata as information about the measurement process, station circumstances, and data. The term “data” is reserved solely for the actual weather and climate records obtained from sensors.

#### **1.4.3. Maintenance**

Inattention to maintenance is the greatest source of failure in weather and climate stations and networks. Problems begin to occur soon after sites are deployed. A regular visit schedule must be implemented, where sites, settings (e.g., vegetation), sensors, communications, and data flow are checked routinely (once or twice a year at a minimum) and updated as necessary. Parts must be changed out for periodic recalibration or replacement. With adequate maintenance, the entire instrument suite should be replaced or completely refurbished about once every five to seven years.

Simple preventive maintenance is effective but requires much planning and skilled technical staff. Changes in technology and products require retraining and continual re-education. Travel, logistics, scheduling, and seasonal access restrictions consume major amounts of time and budget but are absolutely necessary. Without such attention, data gradually become less credible and then often are misused or not used at all.

#### **1.4.4. Automated versus Manual Stations**

Historic stations often have depended on manual observations and many continue to operate in this mode. Manual observations frequently produce excellent data sets. Sensors and data are simple and intuitive, well tested, and relatively cheap. Manual stations have much to offer in certain circumstances and can be a source of both primary and backup data. However, methodical consistency for manual measurements is a constant challenge, especially with a mobile work force. Operating manual stations takes time and needs to be done on a regular schedule, though sometimes the routine is welcome.

Nearly all newer stations are automated. Automated stations provide better time resolution, increased (though imperfect) reliability, greater capacity for data storage, and improved accessibility to large amounts of data. The purchase cost for automated stations is higher than for manual stations. A common expectation and serious misconception is that an automated station can be deployed and left to operate on its own. In reality, automation does not eliminate the need for people but rather changes the type of person that is needed. Skilled technical personnel are needed and must be readily available, especially if live communications exist and data gaps are not wanted. Site visits are needed at least annually and spare parts must be maintained. Typical annual costs for sensors and maintenance are \$1500–2500 per station per year.

#### **1.4.5. Communications**

With manual stations, the observer is responsible for recording and transmitting station data. Data from automated stations, however, can be transmitted quickly for access by research and operations personnel, which is a highly preferable situation. A comparison of communication systems for automated and manual stations shows that automated stations generally require

additional equipment, more power, higher transmission costs, attention to sources of disruption or garbling, and backup procedures (e.g., manual downloads from data loggers).

Automated stations are capable of functioning normally without communication and retaining many months of data. At such sites, however, alerts about station problems are not possible, large gaps can accrue when accessible stations quit, and the constituencies needed to support such stations are smaller and less vocal. Two-way communications permit full recovery from disruptions, ability to reprogram data loggers remotely, and better opportunities for diagnostics and troubleshooting. In virtually all cases, two-way communications are much preferred to all other communication methods. However, two-way communications require considerations of cost, signal access, transmission rates, interference, and methods for keeping sensor and communication power loops separate. Two-way communications are frequently impossible (no service) or impractical, expensive, or power consumptive. Two-way methods (cellular, land line, radio, Internet) require smaller up-front costs as compared to other methods of communication and have variable recurrent costs, starting at zero. Satellite links work everywhere (except when blocked by trees or cliffs) and are quite reliable but are one-way and relatively slow, allow no re-transmissions, and require high up-front costs (\$3000–4000) but no recurrent costs. Communications technology is changing constantly and requires vigilant attention by maintenance personnel.

#### **1.4.6. Quality Assurance and Quality Control**

Quality control and quality assurance are issues at every step through the entire sequence of sensing, communication, storage, retrieval, and display of environmental data. Quality assurance is an umbrella concept that covers all data collection and processing (start-to-finish) and ensures that credible information is available to the end user. Quality control has a more limited scope and is defined by the International Standards Organization as “the operational techniques and activities that are used to satisfy quality requirements.” The central problem can be better appreciated if we approach quality control in the following way.

- Quality control is the evaluation, assessment, and rehabilitation of imperfect data by utilizing other imperfect data.

The quality of the data only decreases with time once the observation is made. The best and most effective quality control, therefore, consists in making high-quality measurements from the start and then successfully transmitting the measurements to an ingest process and storage site. Once the data are received from a monitoring station, a series of checks with increasing complexity can be applied, ranging from single-element checks (self-consistency) to multiple-element checks (inter-sensor consistency) to multiple-station/single-element checks (inter-station consistency). Suitable ancillary data (battery voltages, data ranges for all measurements, etc.) can prove extremely useful in diagnosing problems.

There is rarely a single technique in quality control procedures that will work satisfactorily for all situations. Quality-control procedures must be tailored to individual station circumstances, data access and storage methods, and climate regimes.

The fundamental issue in quality control centers on the tradeoff between falsely rejecting good data (Type I error) and falsely accepting bad data (Type II error). We cannot reduce the incidence of one type of error without increasing the incidence of the other type. In weather and climate data assessments, since good data are absolutely crucial for interpreting climate records properly, Type I errors are deemed far less desirable than Type II errors.

Not all observations are equal in importance. Quality-control procedures are likely to have the greatest difficulty evaluating the most extreme observations, where independent information usually must be sought and incorporated. Quality-control procedures involving more than one station usually involve a great deal of infrastructure with its own (imperfect) error-detection methods, which must be in place before a single value can be evaluated.

#### **1.4.7. Standards**

Although there is near-universal recognition of the value in systematic weather and climate measurements, these measurements will have little value unless they conform to accepted standards. There is not a single source for standards for collecting weather and climate data nor a single standard that meets all needs. Measurement standards have been developed by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO 1983; 2005), the American Association of State Climatologists (AASC 1985), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 1987), Finklin and Fischer (1990), the RAWS program (Bureau of Land Management [BLM] 1997), and the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (2004). Variations to these measurement standards also have been offered by instrument makers (e.g., Tanner 1990).

#### **1.4.8. Who Makes the Measurements?**

The lands under NPS stewardship provide many excellent locations to host the monitoring of climate by the NPS or other collaborators. These lands are largely protected from human development and other land changes that can impact observed climate records. Most park units historically have observed weather and climate elements as part of their overall mission. Many of these measurements come from station networks managed by other agencies, with observations taken or overseen by NPS personnel, in some cases, or by collaborators from the other agencies. National Park Service units that are small, lack sufficient resources, or lack sites presenting adequate exposure may benefit by utilizing weather and climate measurements collected from nearby stations.

## 2.0. Climate Background

The purpose of the majority of existing weather stations in southwest Alaska is to provide weather data for aviation, the primary mode of transportation in the region. Most of these stations are concentrated around human settlements, which are often located at lower elevations either in broad valleys or coastal areas (Bennett et al. 2005). Therefore, weather observations from these stations are frequently not representative of the SWAN region, which is characterized by complex topography and large climatic gradients between the ocean and mountains. It is therefore essential to understand the climate characteristics of the SWAN. Basic SWAN climate characteristics are discussed in this chapter. For a more detailed discussion, please see Redmond et al. (2005).

### 2.1. Climate and the SWAN Environment

Climate is one of the primary factors that determine how ecosystems evolve, differ from each other, and vary from one landscape to another (Chapin et al. 1996). In addition, climate influences heavily the physical processes that occur on the SWAN landscape (Bennett et al. 2005). Climate patterns in SWAN are greatly influenced by the region's high latitude, proximity to oceans, complex topography, and the interaction of all these features with the global circulation (Simpson et al. 2002; Bennett et al. 2005).

Climate interacts with landforms in the SWAN to play a fundamental role in governing ecosystems by influencing four major processes (Bennett et al. 2005):

- Microclimate
- Topographic control of water inputs into lakes
- Wind-mediated disturbances
- Landform-mediated disturbances

Understanding the inputs, storage, movement, and export/loss of water is central to understanding climate as a driving force in SWAN ecosystems. The hydrologic cycle is the primary ecosystem driver, affecting both aquatic and terrestrial plants and animal communities, as well as the physical processes within the landscape. Important features of the climate-hydrological cycle in SWAN park units include winter storms generated by the Aleutian Low, summer storms generated in the Bering Sea, the presence of glaciers, and seasonal snow cover generally persisting from October to April—more than half the year.

The park units in SWAN are aligned along the northern Gulf of Alaska, where the climate is dominated by maritime influences. Relatively mild temperatures (above freezing) and high amounts of precipitation characterize the region.

These maritime influences interact with topography to create complex climate patterns. This region is characterized by steep mountains built as the Pacific Plate slides under the North American Plate. These mountains rise abruptly from the ocean in the path of the prevailing winds and results in orographic uplift and high precipitation on the windward side of the mountains, and rain shadows on the leeward side.

Coastal mountain ranges along the northern Gulf of Alaska are distinguished by being some of the snowiest places on the planet. Coastal areas of KATM, KEFJ, and LACL have the necessary combination of winter precipitation and oceanic air currents, as well as steep temperature and elevational gradients, to generate impressive snowfall and mild winters (Redmond et al. 2005). Wind, topography, and snowfall create a heterogeneous snow distribution that affects local biotic processes by determining water availability and growing season length.

While the Aleutian Low storm track is the predominant climate driver in the Network throughout most of the year, in summer, the Arctic High retreats, the location of the low pressure systems shifts, and the storm track changes direction (Simpson et al. 2002). Instead of moving southeast to northwest, the storms now originate in the west and move east. Within SWAN, this shift in storm track direction changes what is leeward and windward and explains the somewhat surprising drop in precipitation that occurs in Seward in June and July. The Alaska Peninsula appears to be located at the fulcrum of this winter-summer storm track shift. This is an important feature of SWAN climate and explains much of the variation in climate among sites in the Network, particularly with respect to the timing and amount of precipitation.

Because climate is such an important determinant of the ecological setting, changes in climate act as drivers of ecological change. Many climate models predict that future climate change will be greatest at high latitudes (NAST 2001). Indications are that these changes are already occurring in Alaska (Arctic Assessment 2004), with corresponding ecosystem impacts (Bennett et al. 2005). Accurate, long-term climate data sets are important for understanding the relationship between climate and other environmental components. Without such data, it is impossible to fully understand the causes of environmental changes.

Climate changes occur at multiple scales of space and time. At shorter time scales, the climate of the region is affected by primarily oceanic factors, such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) and the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO). The PDO and ENSO are produced by patterns in sea surface temperature driven by changes in the tropics. PDO events have a strong influence on precipitation patterns in the SWAN. During positive PDO events, winter storm tracks that would normally go to southeast Alaska are diverted into the Cook Inlet region, enhancing precipitation in coastal central Alaska, including much of the SWAN (Mantua 2000; Mantua and Hare 2002; Simpson et al. 2002). ENSO events involve mainly temperature and their effects can be widespread, influencing conditions in Interior Alaska, as well as coastal areas.

At very long time scales, SWAN is being affected by post-Pleistocene warming. The entire Network was glaciated during the Pleistocene (Hamilton et al. 1986). The current pattern of glacier distribution in Network parks reflects widespread retreat during the Holocene (the most recent geologic period). In fact, this process appears to have accelerated in recent decades. For instance, in 1938, a glacial toe five miles wide filled Lake Clark Pass (Alaska Geographic Society 1986). Today the glaciers in Lark Clark Pass have receded into the higher mountain valleys, suggesting that the climate has warmed. The sensitive and dynamic response of glaciers to variations in both temperature and precipitation makes them excellent indicators of regional and global climate change at multiple time scales (Redmond et al. 2005). In many higher-elevation regions, where climate measurements are not often readily available, this is especially valuable for tracking long-term climate changes.

Climate changes have broad implications for park resources and long-term monitoring. Climate change-induced shifts in park ecosystems can be manifested in many different ways, on different temporal and spatial scales. Projections of human-induced climate changes and evidence of past rapid climatic shifts indicate that patterns of physical and biological change are occurring on landscape scales in time frames as short as decades (Hannah et al. 2002). Some anticipated changes include sea-level rise, greater storm intensity and frequency, altered seasonal hydrology, accelerated glacial retreat, and shorter duration of lake ice cover. Changes in these physical parameters may not be important by themselves, but may have important effects on biological components of the ecosystem. Water availability in some regions (i.e., Bering Sea drainages) may decline because of a reduction in precipitation and because of reduced snowpack and shorter cold seasons (Schindler 1997). Changes in snow depth and duration will lead to significant shifts in the timing and amount of runoff in SWAN river basins, and may alter the release of nutrients during snowmelt (e.g., Brooks et al. 1998; Groffman et al. 2001; Sickman et al. 2003). Coastal regions of SWAN may experience greater freshwater runoff from precipitation and accelerated melting of glaciers. Ultimately, runoff from the melting glaciers will cease and summer discharge will decline.

Climate changes could affect the distribution, abundance, growth, and productivity of plants and animals. As a result of a longer growing season and higher annual temperatures, alpine areas may decrease as montane tree species migrate upward. New populations of species may move into some areas and existing populations might move out or be lost. These climate changes also have a great influence on the peatlands found in some of the lowlands of SWAN park units (Belland and Vitt 1995). Some animal populations may become isolated and unable to adapt to changing conditions, or they may shift ranges as the climate to which they are adapted effectively moves northward or to higher elevations.

## **2.2. Spatial Variability**

The climate of the SWAN region is heavily influenced by storms originating in the North Pacific and moving along a storm track that parallels the Aleutian chain. Storm frequency for the SWAN region is greatest during the late summer and early fall from August through October (Klein 1957). The coastal SWAN park units have a maritime climate characterized by small temperature variations, high humidity, heavy precipitation, high occurrence of clouds and fog, temperatures generally above freezing, cool summers, and warm winters (Selkregg 1976). The North Pacific high pressure system dominates the area during the summer, bringing south to southwest winds, while in winter the weather is controlled by the Aleutian low atmospheric pressure system. Winds associated with this system are generally north to northwesterly. Additionally, local geographic conditions produce a variety of microclimates (NPS 1999c). Steep mountains rising straight from sea level to over 1500 m (5000 feet) force moisture-laden storms to drop massive loads of snow on areas such as the Harding Icefield, which receives over 1000 cm of snowfall annually and is snow-covered year-round (NPS 1999a).

Mean annual precipitation patterns in the SWAN (Figure 2.1) show that KEFJ is the wettest of the parks, and is wet throughout the park, especially on the coast and at higher elevations. Annual precipitation in the maritime zone is about 150 cm, with 100 wet days per year and about 80 cm of precipitation occurring from mid-July to late December (NPS 1999a). Rainfall is heaviest in Aialik Bay, ranging from 110 to 200 cm during summer months, and decreasing

somewhat along the coast to the west. Aialik Bay often gets up to 10 cm of rainfall in one day, and August 20, 1993 recorded a memorable 26.8 cm (NPS 1999b). The remaining SWAN park units have wet coastal areas and drier interior areas. Of these park units, LACL has the wettest areas, largely by virtue of having high terrain close to the ocean. Along the southeast coastal areas of LACL, where the Chigmit Mountains immediately rise from Cook Inlet, precipitation is quite high, ranging between 40 to 80 in (102 to 203 cm) per year. Cook Inlet offers a more restricted access to moisture than the open ocean, but nonetheless it remains ice free most of the time and does contribute local moisture through evaporation. Annual precipitation decreases on the north and west side of LACL, with annual average precipitation amounts of 40 to 50 cm (NPS 1983).

Annual cycles of mean monthly precipitation (Figure 2.2) show that the driest portion of the year generally occurs from winter into late spring at most locations in the SWAN. Conversely, the wettest portion of the year is generally between summer and early fall. In both the dry and wet seasons (Figures 2.3 and 2.4, respectively), the coastal areas are much wetter than inland areas.

Mean annual temperatures are close to freezing for much of the SWAN, with the exception of the immediate coastal areas (Figure 2.5). This has important implications for this heavily-glaciated terrain. Given the sensitive dependence of glaciers on temperature, much of the ice in this area seems vulnerable to even slight warming (assuming no major changes in precipitation amount or seasonality). In many places only a small shift in temperatures will change the climatic regime from one that is near to below freezing to one that is near to above freezing. All the areas in yellow on this figure are at annual temperatures between 0-2°C below freezing, and a modest climate warming of +2°C would change all these to above freezing, with obvious consequences. It is readily apparent that there are large areas in this circumstance. Locations with long term temperatures near the freezing mark, or just a degree or two below freezing, are thus good candidate locations for monitoring. Some of this ice is flowing downward from cooler source regions, but those regions are only a few degrees cooler. So it appears that the national parks of the southwest coast are in a generally sensitive area for temperature. This argues that there perhaps should eventually be several stations throughout the area, partly to act as checks on each other and to provide some degree of reinforcement and to fill data gaps.

The interior is much colder than the coast in winter (Figure 2.6), but warmer than the coast in summer (Figure 2.7). For instance, in LACL, mean coastal air temperature ranges from -12°C to 0°C during January, while mean temperatures for July range from 9°C to 16°C (NPS 1983). Port Alsworth, located west of the Chigmit Mountains in LACL, represents inland climatic conditions. Mean air temperature ranges from -11°C in January to 13°C in July. Temperature extremes recorded at Port Alsworth range from -48°C in the winter to 30°C in the summer (NPS 1983). During the summer months, the coast-interior temperature gradient becomes less severe, due to the higher sun angle and longer days.





Figure 2.1. Mean annual precipitation, 1961-1990, for the SWAN.

a)



b)




Figure 2.2. Mean monthly precipitation at selected locations in the SWAN. Locations include King Salmon Airport, near KATM (a) and Port Alsworth, near LACL (b).



## Mean Monthly Precipitation - March




Figure 2.3. Mean March precipitation, 1961-1990, for the SWAN.



## Mean Monthly Precipitation - September




Figure 2.4. Mean September precipitation, 1961-1990, for the SWAN.




Figure 2.5. Mean annual temperature, 1961-1990, for the SWAN.



### Mean Monthly Minimum Temperature - January




Figure 2.6. Mean January minimum temperature, 1961-1990, for the SWAN.



## Mean Monthly Maximum Temperature - July




Figure 2.7. Mean July maximum temperature, 1961-1990, for the SWAN.

### **2.3. Temporal Variability**

Climate constantly fluctuates on a variety of temporal scales. The SWAN area experiences two sources of variability that deserve comment. The first of these, the PDO, involves variations in fields of atmospheric wind and pressure and of oceanic temperature and currents in the North Pacific Ocean south of the southern Alaska coastline (Mantua 2000; Mantua and Hare 2002). A single variation is thought to take 50-60 years to undergo a full “oscillation” from one phase and then back again. The cause of this variability is thought to relate to ENSO. The impacts from ENSO cycles are experienced primarily during the winter half of the year and have major effects on the regional climate, the ocean circulation, and on biological organisms and populations, such as salmon (Mantua et al. 1997).

Secondly, much of Alaska has experienced unusually mild winters in recent years. Much of Alaska now shows a clear tendency for warmer temperatures, as temperatures during the 1990s rose substantially beyond those in previous decades (NAST 2001; Redmond et al. 2005; Redmond et al. 2006). In many instances, these findings are being taken as the harbinger of larger-scale planetary warming of the surface of the earth (Mann et al. 1998; NAST 2001). Along the Gulf of Alaska, warming has also been associated with an increase in precipitation of about 30% between 1969 and 1999 (Arctic Assessment 2004). Areas along the coast appear to be less affected than areas inland to the north and east. However, as with much of Alaska, there are compelling reasons for much better knowledge of the variations of climate in this area. There is a possibility of some contribution to warming in Alaska coming from long-term climate variations in the North Pacific (e.g., PDO). Conversely, such natural variations could be enhanced by climate change. For example, the atmosphere may respond to warming by “choosing” certain preferred circulation patterns. The true impacts of climate variability and change in Alaska and the SWAN remain a subject of much speculation and active research.

### **2.4. Parameter Regression on Independent Slopes Model**

The climate maps presented in this report were generated using the Parameter Regression on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM). This model was developed to address the extreme spatial and elevation gradients exhibited by the climate of the western U.S. (Daly et al. 1994; 2002; Gibson et al. 2002; Doggett et al. 2004). The maps produced through PRISM have undergone rigorous evaluation in the western U.S. This model was originally developed to provide climate information at scales matching available land-cover maps to assist in ecologic modeling. The PRISM technique accounts for the scale-dependent effects of topography on mean values of climate elements. Elevation provides the first-order constraint for the mapped climate fields, with slope and orientation (aspect) providing second-order constraints. The model has been enhanced gradually to address inversions, coast/land gradients, and climate patterns in small-scale trapping basins. Monthly climate fields are generated by PRISM to account for seasonal variations in elevation gradients in climate elements. These monthly climate fields then can be combined into seasonal and annual climate fields. Since PRISM maps are grid maps, they do not replicate point values but rather, for a given grid cell, represent the grid-cell average of the climate variable in question at the average elevation for that cell. The model relies on observed surface and upper-air measurements to estimate spatial climate fields.

## 3.0. Methods

Having discussed the climatic characteristics of the SWAN, we now present the procedures that were used to obtain information for weather and climate stations within the SWAN. This information was obtained from various sources, as mentioned in the following paragraphs. Retrieval of station metadata constituted a major component of this work.

### 3.1. Metadata Retrieval

A key component of station inventories is determining the kinds of observations that have been conducted over time, by whom, and in what manner; when each type of observation began and ended; and whether these observations are still being conducted. Metadata about the observational process (Table 3.1) generally consist of a series of vignettes that apply to time intervals and, therefore, constitute a *history* rather than a single snapshot. An expanded list of relevant metadata fields for this inventory is provided in Appendix E. This report has relied on metadata records from three sources: (a) Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC), (b) NPS personnel, and (c) other knowledgeable personnel, such as state climate office staff.

The initial metadata sources for this report were stored at WRCC. This regional climate center (RCC) acts as a working repository of many western climate records, including the main networks outlined in this section. The WRCC conducts live and periodic data collection (ingests) from all major national and western weather and climate networks. These networks include the COOP network, the Surface Airways Observation network (SAO) operated by NWS and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the interagency RAWS network, and various smaller networks. The WRCC is expanding its capability to ingest information from other networks as resources permit and usefulness dictates. This center has relied heavily on historic archives (in many cases supplemented with live ingests) to assess the quantity (not necessarily quality) of data available for NPS I&M network applications.

The primary source of metadata at WRCC is the Applied Climate Information System (ACIS), a joint effort among RCCs and other NOAA entities. Metadata for SWAN weather and climate stations identified from the ACIS database are available in file “SWAN\_from\_ACIS.tar.gz” (see Appendix F). Historic metadata pertaining to major climate- and weather-observing systems in the U.S. are stored in ACIS where metadata are linked to the observed data. A distributed system, ACIS is synchronized among the RCCs. Mainstream software is utilized, including Postgress, Python™, and Java™ programming languages; CORBA®-compliant network software; and industry-standard, nonproprietary hardware and software. Metadata and data for all major national climate and weather networks have been entered into the ACIS database. For this project, the available metadata from many smaller networks also have been entered but in most cases the actual data have not yet been entered. Data sets are in the NetCDF (Network Common Data Form) format, but the design allows for integration with legacy systems, including non-NetCDF files (used at WRCC) and additional metadata (added for this project). The ACIS also supports a suite of products to visualize or summarize data from these data sets. National climate-monitoring maps are updated daily using the ACIS data feed. The developmental phases of ACIS have utilized metadata supplied by the NCDC and NWS with many tens of thousands of entries, screened as well as possible for duplications, mistakes, and omissions.

Table 3.1. Primary metadata fields for SWAN weather and climate stations. Explanations are provided as appropriate.

Metadata Field	Notes
Station name	Station name associated with network listed in “Climate Network.”
Latitude	Numerical value (units: see coordinate units).
Longitude	Numerical value (units: see coordinate units).
Coordinate units	Latitude/longitude (units: decimal degrees, degree-minute-second, etc.).
Datum	Datum used as basis for coordinates: WGS 84, NAD 83, etc.
Elevation	Elevation of station above mean sea level (m).
Slope	Slope of ground surface below station (degrees).
Aspect	Azimuth that ground surface below station faces.
Climate division	NOAA climate division where station is located. Climate divisions are NOAA-specified zones sharing similar climate and hydrology characteristics.
Country	Country where station is located.
State	State where station is located.
County	County where station is located.
Weather/climate network	Primary weather/climate network the station belongs to (COOP, RAWS, etc.).
NPS unit code	Four-letter code identifying park unit where station resides.
NPS unit name	Full name of park unit.
NPS unit type	National park, national monument, etc.
UTM zone	If UTM is the only coordinate system available.
Location notes	Useful information not already included in “station narrative.”
Climate variables	Temperature, precipitation, etc.
Installation date	Date of station installation.
Removal date	Date of station removal.
Station photograph	Digital image of station.
Photograph date	Date photograph was taken.
Photographer	Name of person who took the photograph.
Station narrative	Anything related to general site description; may include site exposure, characteristics of surrounding vegetation, driving directions, etc.
Contact name	Name of the person involved with station operation.
Organization	Group or agency affiliation of contact person.
Contact type	Designation that identifies contact person as the station owner, observer, maintenance person, data manager, etc.
Position/job title	Official position/job title of contact person.
Address	Address of contact person.
E-mail address	E-mail address of contact person.
Phone	Phone number of contact person (and extension if available).
Contact notes	Other information needed to reach contact person.

Two types of information have been used to complete the SWAN climate station inventory.

- **Station inventories:** Information about observational procedures, latitude/longitude, elevation, measured elements, measurement frequency, sensor types, exposures, ground

cover and vegetation, data-processing details, network, purpose, and managing individual or agency, etc.

- Data inventories: Information about measured data values including completeness, seasonality, data gaps, representation of missing data, flagging systems, how special circumstances in the data record are denoted, etc.

This is not a straightforward process. Extensive searches are typically required to develop historic station and data inventories. Both types of inventories frequently contain information gaps and often rely on tacit and unrealistic assumptions. Sources of information for these inventories frequently are difficult to recover or are undocumented and unreliable. In many cases, the actual weather/climate data available from different sources are not linked directly to metadata records. To the extent that actual data can be acquired (rather than just metadata), it is possible to cross-check these records and perform additional assessments based on the amount and completeness of the data.

Certain types of weather and climate networks that possess any of the following attributes have not been considered for inclusion in the inventory:

- Private networks with proprietary access and/or inability to obtain or provide sufficient metadata.
- Private weather enthusiasts (often with high-quality data) whose metadata are not available and whose data are not readily accessible.
- Unofficial observers supplying data to the NWS (lack of access to current data and historic archives; lack of metadata).
- Networks having no available historic data.
- Networks having poor-quality metadata.
- Networks having poor access to metadata.
- Real-time networks having poor access to real-time data.

Previous inventory efforts at WRCC have shown that for the weather networks identified in the preceding list, in light of the need for quality data to track weather and climate, the resources required and difficulty encountered in obtaining metadata or data are prohibitively large.

### **3.2. Criteria for Locating Stations**

To identify weather and climate stations for each park unit in the SWAN we selected only those stations located within 60 km of the SWAN park units. This buffer distance was selected in an attempt to include automated stations from major networks such as RAWS and SNOTEL.

The station locator maps presented in Chapter 4 were designed to show clearly the spatial distributions of all major weather and climate station networks in SWAN. We recognize that other mapping formats may be more suitable for other specific needs.

## 4.0. Station Inventory

An objective of this report is to show the locations of weather and climate stations for the SWAN region in relation to the boundaries of the NPS park units within the SWAN. A station does not have to be within park boundaries to provide useful data and information for a park unit.

### 4.1. Climate and Weather Networks

Most stations in the SWAN region are associated with at least one of seven major weather and climate networks (Table 4.1). Brief descriptions of each weather/climate network are provided below (see Appendix G for greater detail).

Table 4.1. Weather and climate networks represented within the SWAN.

Acronym	Name
COOP	NWS Cooperative Observer Program
CWOP	Citizen Weather Observer Program
NRCS-SC	USDA/NRCS snowcourse network
RAWS	Remote Automated Weather Station network
SAO	NWS/FAA Surface Airways Observation network
SCAN	USDA/NRCS Soil Climate Analysis Network
SNOTEL	USDA/NRCS Snowfall Telemetry network

#### 4.1.1. NWS Cooperative Observer Program (COOP)

The COOP network has been a foundation of the U.S. climate program for decades and continues to play an important role. Manual measurements are made by volunteers and consist of daily maximum and minimum temperatures, observation-time temperature, daily precipitation, daily snowfall, and snow depth. When blended with NWS measurements, the data set is known as SOD, or “Summary of the Day.” The quality of data from COOP sites ranges from excellent to modest.

#### 4.1.2. Citizen Weather Observer Program (CWOP)

The CWOP network consists primarily of automated weather stations operated by private citizens who have either an Internet connection and/or a wireless Ham radio setup. Data from CWOP stations are specifically intended for use in research, education, and homeland security activities. Although standard meteorological elements such as temperature, precipitation, and wind are measured at all CWOP stations, station characteristics do vary, including sensor types and site exposure.

#### 4.1.3. USDA/NRCS Snowcourse Network (NRCS-SC)

The USDA/NRCS maintains a network of snow-monitoring stations in addition to SNOTEL (described below). These sites are known as snowcourses. These are all manual sites, measuring only snow depth and snow water content one–two times per month during the months of January to June. Data records for these snowcourses often extend back to the 1920s or 1930s, and the data are generally of high quality. Many of these sites have been replaced by SNOTEL sites, but several hundred snowcourses are still in operation.

#### **4.1.4. Remote Automated Weather Station (RAWS) Network**

The RAWS network is administered through many land management agencies, particularly the BLM and the Forest Service. Hourly meteorology elements are measured and include temperature, wind, humidity, solar radiation, barometric pressure, fuel temperature, and precipitation (when temperatures are above freezing). The fire community is the primary client for RAWS data. These sites are remote and data typically are transmitted via GOES (Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite). Some sites operate all winter. Most data records for RAWS sites began during or after the mid-1980s.

#### **4.1.5. NWS Surface Airways Observation Network (SAO)**

These stations are located usually at major airports and military bases. Almost all SAO sites are automated. The hourly data measured at these sites include temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind, barometric pressure, sky cover, ceiling, visibility, and current weather. Most data records begin during or after the 1940s, and these data are generally of high quality.

#### **4.1.6. USDA/NRCS Soil Climate Analysis Network (SCAN)**

The SCAN network is administered by NRCS and is intended to be a comprehensive nationwide soil moisture and climate information system to be used in supporting natural resource assessments and other conservation activities. These stations are usually located in the agricultural areas of the U.S. All SCAN sites are automated. The parameters measured at these sites include air temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind, pressure, solar radiation, snow depth, and snow water content.

#### **4.1.7. USDA/NRCS Snowfall Telemetry (SNOTEL) Network**

The USDA/NRCS maintains a network of automated snow-monitoring stations known as SNOTEL. The network was implemented originally to measure daily precipitation and snow water content. Many modern SNOTEL sites now record hourly data, with some sites now recording temperature and snow depth. Most data records began during or after the mid-1970s.

#### **4.1.8. Weather Bureau Army Navy (WBAN)**

Some stations are identified in this report as WBAN stations. This is a station identification system rather than a true weather or climate network. Stations identified with WBAN are largely historical stations that reported meteorological observations on the WBAN weather observation forms that were common during the early and middle parts of the twentieth century. The use of WBAN numbers to identify stations was one of the first attempts in the U.S. to use a coordinated station numbering scheme between several weather station networks, such as the COOP and SAO networks.

#### **4.1.9. Other Networks**

In addition to the major networks mentioned above, there are various networks that are operated for specific purposes by specific organizations or governmental agencies or scientific research projects. These networks could be present within SWAN but have not been identified in this report. Some of the commonly used networks include the following:

- NOAA upper-air stations
- Federal and state departments of transportation

- U.S. Department of Energy Surface Radiation Budget Network (Surfrad)
- Park-specific-monitoring networks and stations
- Other research or project networks having many possible owners

## 4.2. Station Locations

The major weather and climate networks in the SWAN (discussed in Section 4.1) have at most several stations at or inside each park unit (Table 4.2). Most of these are NRCS-SC stations.

Lists of stations have been compiled for the SWAN. As previously noted, a station does not have to be within the boundaries to provide useful data and information regarding the park unit in question. Some might be physically *within* the administrative or political boundaries, whereas others might be just outside, or even some distance away, but would be *nearby* in terms of behavior and representativeness. What constitutes “useful” and “representative” are also significant questions, whose answers can vary according to application, type of element, period of record, procedural or methodological observation conventions, and the like.

Table 4.2. Number of stations within or nearby SWAN park units. Numbers are listed by park unit and by weather/climate network. Figures in parentheses indicate the numbers of stations within park boundaries.

Network	ALAG	ANIA	KATM	KEFJ	LACL
COOP	4(0)	3(0)	8(2)	37(1)	21(3)
CWOP	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)	1(0)	0(0)
NRCS-SC	1(0)	0(0)	2(2)	20(1)	8(4)
RAWS	0(0)	2(0)	2(0)	8(1)	3(2)
SAO	1(0)	2(0)	2(0)	5(0)	5(0)
SCAN	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(0)	0(0)
SNOTEL	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	11(1)	3(0)
Other	1(0)	1(0)	1(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Total	7(0)	10(0)	15(4)	84(4)	40(9)

No weather or climate stations were identified within ALAG (Table 4.3; Figure 4.1). The only active stations we identified within 60 km of the park unit are the COOP and SAO sites at King Salmon, located 42 km southwest of ALAG. The data records at these two sites (1917-present) have been quite complete since 1955. Before 1955, these same data records were still fairly complete but had scattered data gaps. The COOP stations “Brooks Lake” and “Brooks River,” which are no longer active, were located almost 60 km south of ALAG, within KATM. Similarly, the NRCS-SC site “Brooks Camp” is located almost 60 km south of ALAG in KATM.

No weather or climate stations were identified within ANIA (Table 4.3; Figure 4.2). There are no active COOP stations within 60 km of ANIA. The only active stations we identified within 60 km of the park unit are near-real-time weather stations associated with the CWOP, RAWS, and SAO networks. The closest near-real-time stations to ANIA are the RAWS sites “Black Lake” and “Mother Goose,” both located 21 km northeast of ANIA. These sites have been operating since early 2004. “Black Lake” has a data gap in February 2004 but has an otherwise-complete data record. “Mother Goose” has been unreliable since January 2006. Two CWOP stations were identified near Chignik, almost 50 km southwest of ANIA. Finally, the SAO station “Chignik Arpt.” is 45 km southwest of ANIA and has been active since May 2005.

Table 4.3. Weather and climate stations for SWAN park units. Stations inside a park unit and within 60 km of the park unit boundary are included. Missing entries are indicated by "M".

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
<b>Alagnak Wild River (ALAG)</b>							
Brooks Lake	58.550	-155.817	12	COOP	1/1/1951	9/30/1972	No
Brooks River	58.550	-155.783	13	COOP	7/1/1967	5/1/1990	No
King Salmon	58.684	-156.654	14	COOP	6/14/1917	Present	No
Kokhanok Bay	59.417	-154.867	37	COOP	2/1/1955	9/30/1959	No
Brooks Camp	58.533	-155.767	46	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
King Salmon	58.684	-156.654	14	SAO	6/14/1917	Present	No
Naknek	58.683	-156.733	15	WBAN	7/1/1935	11/30/1941	No
<b>Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve (ANIA)</b>							
Chignik	56.300	-158.400	9	COOP	4/1/1927	6/30/1978	No
Pilot Point	57.617	-157.567	15	COOP	12/1/1938	12/31/1945	No
Port Heiden	56.950	-158.617	28	COOP	9/1/1942	10/31/1988	No
CW1514 Chignik Lagoon	56.308	-158.539	6	CWOP	M	Present	No
CW0326 Chignik	56.300	-158.536	5	CWOP	M	Present	No
Black Lake	57.179	-157.278	53	RAWS	1/1/2004	Present	No
Mother Goose	57.179	-157.278	53	RAWS	3/1/2004	Present	No
Chignik Arpt.	56.311	-158.373	5	SAO	5/11/2005	Present	No
Port Heiden	56.950	-158.617	28	SAO	9/1/1942	10/31/1988	No
Port Heiden AAF	56.950	-158.650	26	WBAN	8/1/1942	10/31/1945	No
<b>Katmai National Park and Preserve (KATM)</b>							
Brooks Lake	58.550	-155.817	12	COOP	1/1/1951	9/30/1972	Yes
Brooks River	58.550	-155.783	13	COOP	7/1/1967	5/1/1990	Yes
Brooks Camp	58.533	-155.767	46	NRCS-SC	M	M	Yes
Three Forks	58.367	-155.467	274	NRCS-SC	M	M	Yes
Augustine	59.417	-153.417	9	COOP	7/1/1972	8/31/1973	No
Big Bay R.S.	58.552	-152.608	9	COOP	5/19/1991	Present	No
Iliamna	59.754	-154.907	56	COOP	2/1/1920	Present	No
Intricate Bay	59.555	-154.498	37	COOP	8/1/1959	Present	No
King Salmon	58.684	-156.654	14	COOP	6/14/1917	Present	No
Kokhanok Bay	59.417	-154.867	37	COOP	2/1/1955	9/30/1959	No
Black Cape	58.407	-152.886	23	RAWS	7/1/2001	Present	No
Chief Cove	57.729	-153.933	46	RAWS	7/1/2001	Present	No
Iliamna	59.754	-154.907	56	SAO	2/1/1920	Present	No
King Salmon	58.684	-156.654	14	SAO	6/14/1917	Present	No
Naknek	58.683	-156.733	15	WBAN	7/1/1935	11/30/1941	No
<b>Kenai Fjords National Park (KEFJ)</b>							
Seward 8 NW	60.188	-149.628	125	COOP	6/7/1983	Present	Yes
Exit Glacier	60.183	-149.617	122	NRCS-SC	M	M	Yes
Harding Icefield	60.149	-149.799	1280	RAWS	7/1/2004	Present	Yes
Nuka River	59.667	-150.683	396	SNOTEL	M	Present	Yes
Anchor Point	59.747	-151.754	52	COOP	10/21/2002	Present	No
Anchor Point River	59.772	-151.836	10	COOP	8/1/1984	Present	No
Bear Cove	59.733	-151.033	24	COOP	11/1/1955	12/31/1972	No

<b>Name</b>	<b>Lat.</b>	<b>Lon.</b>	<b>Elev. (m)</b>	<b>Network</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>End</b>	<b>In Park?</b>
Bradley Lake	59.750	-150.833	336	COOP	9/1/1969	3/31/1977	No
Cooper Lake Project	60.393	-149.666	154	COOP	11/18/1958	Present	No
Cooper Landing	60.488	-149.968	114	COOP	5/1/1974	Present	No
Cooper Landing Kenai R.	60.492	-149.809	128	COOP	9/1/1941	Present	No
Funny River	60.482	-150.806	84	COOP	5/21/2003	Present	No
Halibut Cove	59.600	-151.167	9	COOP	7/1/1974	5/8/2001	No
Homer	59.762	-151.210	428	COOP	11/18/2002	Present	No
Homer	59.643	-151.487	20	COOP	9/1/1932	Present	No
Homer 17 E	59.767	-151.167	305	COOP	1/1/1991	5/1/1991	No
Homer 2 NW	59.666	-151.564	309	COOP	8/1/2003	Present	No
Homer 8 NW	59.744	-151.551	329	COOP	10/1/1977	Present	No
Homer 9 E	59.716	-151.326	156	COOP	7/20/1988	Present	No
Homer Research Ctr.	59.700	-151.317	85	COOP	10/1/1973	1/31/1979	No
Kasitsna Bay	59.467	-151.550	3	COOP	5/1/1967	Present	No
Kenai Keys River	60.483	-150.617	38	COOP	8/16/1979	Present	No
Lawing Trail River	60.407	-149.370	140	COOP	7/1/1975	Present	No
Lawing Trail River 2 N	60.432	-149.373	140	COOP	6/1/1985	Present	No
Moose Pass 3 NW	60.503	-149.426	141	COOP	7/29/1941	Present	No
Moose Pass 6 NW	60.533	-149.517	201	COOP	4/1/1979	2/1/1980	No
Nanwalek	59.356	-151.921	14	COOP	7/27/2001	Present	No
Port Chatham	59.217	-151.750	3	COOP	3/27/1980	8/31/1980	No
Port Graham	59.353	-151.836	11	COOP	12/1/1999	10/14/2003	No
Seldovia	59.433	-151.700	6	COOP	12/1/1916	6/29/1964	No
Seldovia Dock	59.433	-151.700	9	COOP	6/1/1967	7/31/1975	No
Seward	60.104	-149.444	34	COOP	2/1/1908	Present	No
Seward 14 N	60.283	-149.333	145	COOP	8/21/1985	7/3/2001	No
Seward 19 N	60.354	-149.348	138	COOP	11/1/1986	Present	No
Seward Resurrection	60.128	-149.417	12	COOP	6/1/1977	Present	No
Sterling	60.533	-150.750	55	COOP	9/1/1950	5/31/1968	No
The Tices	59.683	-151.650	275	COOP	3/1/1952	5/31/1975	No
Tri Nal Acres	60.550	-150.533	99	COOP	5/1/1971	10/1/1987	No
Tutka Bay Lagoon	59.436	-151.414	19	COOP	5/1/1979	8/20/2004	No
Venta	59.833	-150.967	46	COOP	9/1/1958	4/30/1967	No
CW4522 Ninilchik	60.058	-151.250	424	CWOP	M	Present	No
Anchor River Divide	59.867	-151.317	488	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Bertha Creek	60.750	-149.250	290	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Bridge Creek	59.733	-151.467	396	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Cooper Lake	60.383	-149.683	366	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Demonstration Forest	59.667	-151.650	238	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Eagle Lake	59.833	-151.133	427	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Grandview	60.600	-149.067	335	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Grouse Creek Divide	60.267	-149.350	213	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Jean Lake	60.517	-150.183	189	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Kachemak Creek	59.733	-150.667	506	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Kenai Summit	60.667	-149.483	424	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
McNeil Canyon	59.750	-151.250	402	NRCS-SC	M	M	No

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
Moose Pass	60.517	-149.500	213	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Nuka Glacier	59.700	-150.717	381	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Pass Creek	60.767	-149.683	366	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Port Graham	59.333	-151.833	91	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Resurrection Pass	60.683	-149.750	686	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Snug Harbor Road	60.400	-149.350	152	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Summit Creek	60.617	-149.533	427	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Broadview	60.483	-149.767	190	RAWS	9/1/1989	Present	No
Granite	60.728	-149.287	156	RAWS	5/1/1997	Present	No
Homer	59.746	-151.208	218	RAWS	5/1/1998	Present	No
Hope	60.783	-149.433	137	RAWS	9/1/1989	5/31/1993	No
Kenai Lake	60.367	-149.400	145	RAWS	9/1/1989	Present	No
Kenai NWR	60.592	-150.317	122	RAWS	6/1/1988	Present	No
Skilak Guard Station	60.484	-150.461	180	RAWS	5/1/2000	Present	No
Homer	59.643	-151.487	20	SAO	9/1/1932	Present	No
Seldovia	59.433	-151.700	6	SAO	12/1/1916	6/29/1964	No
Seldovia Arpt.	59.443	-151.702	9	SAO	5/2/1997	Present	No
Seward	60.104	-149.444	34	SAO	2/1/1908	Present	No
Seward Arpt.	60.128	-149.417	7	SAO	3/26/1953	Present	No
Moose Inc.	59.680	-151.370	40	SCAN	M	Present	No
Schor Garden	59.680	-151.380	120	SCAN	M	Present	No
Anchor River Divide	59.867	-151.317	488	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Cooper Lake	60.383	-149.683	366	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Grandview	60.600	-149.067	335	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Grouse Creek Divide	60.267	-149.350	213	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
McNeil Canyon	59.750	-151.250	402	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Middle Fork Bradley	59.767	-150.750	701	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Nuka Glacier	59.683	-150.700	381	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Port Graham	59.350	-151.833	91	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Ptarmigan Hills	59.717	-150.700	366	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Summit Creek	60.617	-149.533	427	SNOTEL	M	Present	No

**Lake Clark National Park and Preserve (LACL)**

Port Alsworth	60.203	-154.316	79	COOP	6/1/1960	Present	Yes
Sargent Creek	59.967	-152.717	18	COOP	6/1/1964	1/31/1965	Yes
Tanalian Point	60.217	-154.367	92	COOP	5/1/1939	4/15/1960	Yes
Fishtrap Lake	60.500	-154.333	549	NRCS-SC	M	M	Yes
Port Alsworth	60.200	-154.317	-3048	NRCS-SC	M	M	Yes
Telaquana Lake	60.817	-153.917	472	NRCS-SC	M	M	Yes
Upper Twin Lakes	60.817	-153.800	610	NRCS-SC	M	M	Yes
Port Alsworth	60.196	-154.320	79	RAWS	6/1/1992	Present	Yes
Stoney	61.001	-153.896	381	RAWS	6/1/1992	Present	Yes
Augustine	59.417	-153.417	9	COOP	7/1/1972	8/31/1973	No
Big River Lakes	60.814	-152.297	12	COOP	11/21/1977	Present	No
Chinitna Bay	59.750	-153.233	92	COOP	M	Present	No
Chisik Island	60.100	-152.583	9	COOP	6/1/1960	8/31/1970	No
Drift River	60.583	-152.150	12	COOP	3/1/1968	Present	No

Name	Lat.	Lon.	Elev. (m)	Network	Start	End	In Park?
Iliamna	59.754	-154.907	56	COOP	2/1/1920	Present	No
Iniskin	59.750	-153.233	92	COOP	11/1/1954	3/31/1962	No
Intricate Bay	59.555	-154.498	37	COOP	8/1/1959	Present	No
Kalgin Island	60.450	-151.917	9	COOP	10/6/1987	3/1/1988	No
Kenai 9 N	60.669	-151.323	38	COOP	6/7/1983	Present	No
Kokhanok Bay	59.417	-154.867	37	COOP	2/1/1955	9/30/1959	No
Nikiski Terminal	60.667	-151.383	112	COOP	6/1/1967	11/30/1979	No
Ninilchik	60.050	-151.667	37	COOP	10/6/1940	5/31/1968	No
Ninilchik 5 NE	60.100	-151.583	64	COOP	7/1/1968	6/30/1969	No
Ninilchik R. at Nihil	60.048	-151.665	0	COOP	5/24/1988	Present	No
Silver Salmon Creek	59.967	-152.667	46	COOP	8/1/1966	5/31/1967	No
Sparrevohn	61.100	-155.550	482	COOP	5/1/1953	12/1/1984	No
Tyonek	61.067	-151.133	15	COOP	11/1/1898	11/30/1970	No
Chuitna Plateau	61.217	-151.633	469	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Congahbuna Lake	61.067	-151.433	152	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Granite Point	61.017	-151.450	76	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Lone Ridge	61.233	-151.467	511	NRCS-SC	M	M	No
Ninilchik	60.043	-151.666	40	RAWS	6/1/1992	Present	No
Big River Lakes	60.814	-152.297	12	SAO	11/21/1977	Present	No
Iliamna	59.754	-154.907	56	SAO	2/1/1920	Present	No
Kenai Anchorage	60.733	-151.350	74	SAO	9/9/1993	Present	No
Merrill Pass West	61.267	-153.800	357	SAO	5/11/2005	Present	No
Sparrevohn Mtn. AFS	61.100	-155.583	529	SAO	7/1/1951	Present	No
Botts Creek	61.167	-151.633	457	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Chuitna Plateau	61.217	-151.633	469	SNOTEL	M	Present	No
Congahbuna Lake	61.067	-151.433	152	SNOTEL	M	Present	No

We identified four stations within KATM (Table 4.3; Figure 4.1). All of these stations are located in western KATM. The COOP stations we identified (Brooks Lake; Brooks River) are no longer active. It is not known if either of the two NRCS-SC sites within the park unit (Brooks Camp; Three Forks) are active.

The closest active COOP station to KATM is at King Salmon, 7 km west of KATM. This station and the collocated SAO station have been discussed previously. Another set of longer climate records are found at the COOP and SAO stations located at Iliamna, 53 km north of KATM. These data records (1920-present) have been very complete with the exception of unreliable data in the early 1970s as well as a gap from December 1997 to February 1999. The COOP station “Intricate Bay” is 36 km north of KATM and has a very reliable data record (1959-present). The COOP station “Big Bay R.S.” (1991-present) is 45 km east of KATM.

Besides the SAO stations at Iliamna and King Salmon, two additional sources of near-real-time weather data within 60 km of KATM include the RAWS sites “Black Cape” (2001-present) and “Chief Cove” (2001-present) (Table 4.3; Figure 4.1). Both “Black Cape” and “Chief Cove” have



## Weather - Climate Observing Sites (SWAN Network)




Figure 4.1. Station locations for SWAN park units.



### Weather - Climate Observing Sites (Aniakchak NM & Preserve)




Figure 4.2. Station locations for ANIA.

data gaps in February through May of 2004, while “Black Cape” has an additional data gap from January through July of 2005.

We identified four weather and climate stations within KEFJ (Table 4.3; Figure 4.3). These stations are located either in far northern KEFJ or in southwestern KEFJ. The only station located in southwestern KEFJ is the SNOTEL station “Nuka River,” which provides valuable near-real-time data for the region, particularly snowfall. The COOP station “Seward 8 NW” is located in northern KEFJ. Its data record (1983-present) has numerous data gaps during the past five years. Also located in northern KEFJ are the NRCS-SC station “Exit Glacier” and the RAWS station “Harding Icefield.” The RAWS station has been active since 2004 and has a reliable data record.

We identified 36 COOP stations, 20 of which are active, within 60 km of the boundaries of KEFJ (Table 4.3). The COOP station “Seward,” 5 km northeast of KEFJ, has been active since 1908, providing the longest data record of the active COOP stations near the park unit. The data record at this site has been very complete up until the last 10 years. The COOP station “Homer,” 34 km west of KEFJ, has been active since 1932 and has a very reliable data record. The COOP station “Cooper Landing Kenai R.” is 21 km north of KEFJ but its data record (1941-present) is not reliable. The COOP station “Moose Pass 3 NW,” which is 34 km north of KEFJ, has numerous data gaps in its record (1941-present). The COOP station “Cooper Lake Project” is located 12 km north of KEFJ and has been operating since 1958. This site’s data record is fairly complete although there are generally no weekend observations. Several other COOP stations within 60 km of KEFJ have data records extending back to the 1970s and 1980s.

Nineteen NRCS-SC stations were identified outside of KEFJ, within 60 km of the park unit. Most of these sites are located either in the Homer area or in the mountains to the north of KEFJ.

We identified seven RAWS stations, six of which are active, within 60 km of the boundaries of KEFJ (Table 4.3). The RAWS station “Broadview” is 20 km north of the park unit, at the west end of Kenai Lake, and has been active since 1989. The RAWS station “Granite” is 56 km northeast of the park unit and has been active since 1997. The RAWS station “Homer” (1998-present) is 33 km west of KEFJ. The data records at these three sites have been reliable since April 2001. The RAWS station “Kenai Lake” is 23 km northeast of the park unit and has been active since 1989. With the exception of one gap in January 2004, the data record at this site has been reliable since April 2001. The RAWS station “Kenai NWR,” 55 km northwest of KEFJ, has had scattered data gaps during its period of record (1988-present). The last gap at this site occurred from January through April of 2006. The RAWS station “Skilak Guard Station” is 46 km northwest of KEFJ and its data record (2000-present) has been reliable since April 2002.

Five SAO stations were identified within 60 km of the boundaries of KEFJ (Table 4.3). Only one of these (Seldovia) is no longer active. The longest record is at the SAO station “Seward,” which is 5 km northeast of KEFJ and has been active since 1908. Another SAO station in the Seward area is “Seward Arpt.” (1953-present), which is 6 km northeast of KEFJ. The SAO station “Homer” is 34 km west of KEFJ and has been active since 1932. The SAO station “Seldovia Arpt.” is 41 km southwest of KEFJ and has been active since 1997.



### Weather - Climate Observing Sites (Kenai Fjords NP & Lake Clark NP & Pres)




Figure 4.3. Station locations for KEFJ and LACL.

In addition to these RAWS and SAO stations, 10 SNOTEL stations are located within 60 km of KEFJ and provide near-real-time data. The closest station, “Nuka Glacier,” is just outside the southern boundary of KEFJ. Also near southern KEFJ is the SNOTEL station “Ptarmigan Hills,” which is 5 km north of the park unit. In northern KEFJ, the closest SNOTEL site is “Cooper Lake,” which is 11 km north of KEFJ.

We identified nine stations within LACL (Table 4.3; Figure 4.1). At least three of these stations are known to be active. The COOP station “Port Alsworth” has been active since 1960 in southwestern LACL and has a very reliable data record. The two RAWS stations we identified in LACL, “Port Alsworth” and “Stoney,” both have data records going back to 1992. “Port Alsworth” is in southwestern LACL and its data record has several notable gaps, including January through March of 1993, December 1995 through January 1996, and April through June of 2006. “Stoney” is in northwestern LACL and its data record has numerous gaps, especially in the 1990s. The latest gap at “Stoney” occurred from January to June of 2004. The four NRCS-SC sites we identified for LACL are located in the western part of the park unit.

We identified 18 COOP stations, seven of which are active, within 60 km of the boundaries of LACL (Table 4.3). The best sources of longer climate records come from the COOP stations “Iliamna” and “Intricate Bay.” Both of these stations’ data records have been discussed previously. “Iliamna” is 18 km southwest of LACL, while “Intricate Bay” is 38 km south of LACL. The COOP station “Drift River” is 15 km east of LACL and has been active since 1968. This site does not have a reliable data record. Two other COOP stations within 60 km of LACL have data records extending back to the 1980s (Kenai 9 N; Ninilchik R. at Ninil).

Four NRCS-SC stations were identified outside of LACL, within 60 km of the park unit. Most of these sites are located along the west shore of Cook Inlet, north and east of LACL (Figure 4.1).

One RAWS station was identified within 60 km of LACL boundaries (Table 4.3). “Ninilchik” (1992-present) is 50 km east of LACL, on the Kenai Peninsula (see Figure 4.1), and has provided near-real-time data in a reliable manner since May 2002. Five SAO stations, all active, were identified within 60 km of the boundaries of LACL (Table 4.3). The closest SAO station to LACL is “Merrill Pass West,” which is 2 km northwest of the park unit. On the other side of LACL, the SAO station “Big River Lakes” is only 5 km northeast of the park unit boundary. The longest record among these SAO sites is at “Iliamna” (1920-present), which was discussed previously. This SAO site is 18 km southwest of LACL. The SAO station “Kenai Anchorage” (1993-present) is 48 km east of LACL, while the SAO station “Sparrevohn Mtn. AFS” is 59 km west of LACL and has been active since 1951. In addition to these RAWS and SAO stations, three SNOTEL stations are located within 60 km of LACL and provide near-real-time data. The closest station, “Botts Creek,” is 42 km northeast of LACL.

## **5.0. Conclusions and Recommendations**

We have based our findings on an examination of available climate records within SWAN units, discussions with NPS staff and other collaborators, and prior knowledge of the area. Here, we offer an evaluation and general comments pertaining to the status, prospects, and needs for climate-monitoring capabilities in SWAN.

### **5.1. Southwest Alaska Inventory and Monitoring Network**

Recent reports on climate monitoring in the SWAN have pointed out the lack of weather and climate station coverage within large portions of SWAN park units (e.g., Redmond et al. 2005; Giffen 2007). Redmond et al. (2005) conducted a thorough review of the climate-monitoring needs in the SWAN and noted candidate sites for new weather stations within the network; many of the pertinent recommendations for this network are presented there. The SWAN network has taken the recommendations from Redmond et al. (2005) and, along with field reconnaissance trips in 2006 and additional input from the NWS office in Anchorage, has selected locations for weather station installations in both KATM and KEFJ (Giffen 2007). In KATM, seven on-site surveys and 10 aerial surveys were completed to identify candidate locations. The top three new KATM sites identified from the on-site surveys were 1) Coville, 2) Phaff, and 3) Contact Creek/Three Forks (tie). The top three new KATM sites identified from the aerial surveys were 1) Cape Gull, 2) Hallo Bay Lodge, and 3) Dark South/Swishak (tie) (Giffen 2007). In KEFJ, seven on-site surveys were completed, with the top four new sites selected being 1) Yalik, 2) McArthur Pass, 3) Dinglstadt Glacier, and 4) Fire Cove (Giffen 2007). Station installations are planned at the above sites within the next year or two, pending the results of an environmental compliance evaluation which will investigate potential negative environmental impacts of these new station installations. Site surveys will also be conducted for LACL during the next year or two to identify suitable sites for weather station installations within that park unit (Giffen 2007). In all of these cases, the deciding factor for where to install new weather stations will center around site accessibility, as much of the terrain within SWAN parks is very remote. This factor, along with the severe climate conditions in SWAN, will create difficulties for maintaining new stations.

Despite the encouraging efforts to expand weather station coverage in park units such as KATM and LACL, it is not clear what climate monitoring efforts are planned for ANIA, based on recent reports from SWAN staff (e.g., Giffen 2007). Options for new station installations in ANIA are discussed in Redmond et al. (2005).

There are very few climate stations in the SWAN having even moderately-long-term, homogeneous, complete, and reliable records. The difficulty of finding such stations within the SWAN underscores the necessity of maintaining observations at those long-term climate stations that are operating currently.

### **5.2. Spatial Variations in Mean Climate**

Topography is a major controlling factor on the park units within the SWAN, leading to systematic spatial variations in mean surface climate. With local variations over short horizontal and vertical distances, topography introduces considerable fine-scale structure to mean climate

(temperature and precipitation). Issues encountered in mapping mean climate are discussed in Appendix D and in Redmond et al. (2005).

For those regions where no weather or climate stations exist currently, if only a few stations will be emplaced, the primary goal should be overall characterization of the main climate elements (temperature and precipitation, and snow). This level of characterization generally requires that (a) stations should not be located in deep valley bottoms (cold air drainage pockets) or near excessively steep slopes and (b) stations should be distributed spatially in the major biomes of each park. If such stations already are present in the vicinity, then additional stations would be best used for two important and somewhat competing purposes: (a) add redundancy as backup for loss of data from current stations (or loss of the physical stations) or (b) provide added information on spatial heterogeneity in climate arising from topographic diversity, particularly inversions.

The desirability of credible and accurate long-term complete climate records, from any location, cannot be overstressed. This consideration should thus always have a high priority. However, because of spatial and elevation diversity in climate, monitoring that fills knowledge gaps, and in the bargain provides information on long-term temporal variability in short-distance relationships, will also likely prove of inestimable value. We cannot be sure that climate variability and climate change will affect all parts of a given park unit equally; it is in fact a safe bet that this is not the case, and that the spatial variations in temporal variability extend to small spatial scales (a few km or less in some cases), a consequence of extreme elevation diversity.

### **5.3. Climate Change Detection**

The higher latitudes are likely to be some of the first regions to experience the effects of climate change, most obviously through effects of temperature on large masses of ice near critical temperatures, and behavior of fish and wildlife (Bennett et al. 2005). Though there is not as much agreement about potential precipitation changes as about temperature changes, there is a general consensus among models that higher latitudes will probably become wetter. Alaska parks are therefore in a unique position, and adequate monitoring of all potentially affected systems should be well under way before any such changes become widespread.

Significant portions of mountainous areas in the SWAN are near the mean annual freezing mark. In these zones, small changes that move temperature from below to above freezing have significant potential to affect mass balance of icefields, and to affect the character of storms by increasing the ratio of rain to snow. The elevation of the rain/snow line, the manner of accumulation during the winter, the way the snowpack ripens in the spring, the timing of the spring snowmelt runoff pulse, and the summer loss of ice, would all be affected by changes in temperature.

The SWAN network already has plans underway to locate some new weather stations at sites that have mean annual temperatures just below freezing (approximately 1-3°C below freezing) in order to monitor the possible climate changes listed above. Such locations are expected to show new behavior if a biological temperature control (either warm or cool, or lack of warmth or lack of cool) is either removed or caused to be much less likely. Other sites the SWAN network is

considering will allow the network to monitor possible changes in the ranges of a number of important plant and animal species in response to future climate changes.

The effects of climate change on SWAN ecosystems will likely vary, depending on elevation. The Pacific Ocean is a tremendous flywheel for stored energy, and changes in temperature next to the ocean may differ from changes in the mountainous interior of the SWAN. Based on climate change considerations alone, a recommended strategy for additional weather station installations would entail station placement in the pure coastal zone, in the pure interior zone, at higher elevations closer to the location of what is now quasi-permanent ice, and in transition regions such as drainage divides. The idea of transects spanning transitions from marine to interior climates also has great merit.

#### **5.4. Aesthetics**

This issue arises frequently enough to deserve comment. Standards for quality climate measurements require open exposures away from heat sources, buildings, pavement, close vegetation and tall trees, and human intrusion (thus away from property lines). By their nature, sites that meet these standards are usually quite visible. In many settings (such as heavily forested areas) these sites also are quite rare, making them precisely the same places that managers wish to protect from aesthetic intrusion. The most suitable and scientifically defensible sites frequently are rejected as candidate locations for stations. Most weather and climate stations, therefore, tend to be “hidden” but many of these hidden locations have inferior exposures. Some measure of compromise is nearly always called for in siting weather and climate stations.

The public has vast interest and curiosity in weather and climate, and within the NPS I&M networks, such measurements consistently rate near or at the top of desired public information. There seem to be many possible opportunities for exploiting and embracing this widespread interest within the interpretive mission of the NPS. One way to do this would be to highlight rather than hide these stations and educate the public about the need for adequate siting. A number of weather displays we have encountered during visits have proven inadvertently to serve as counterexamples for how measurements should not be made.

#### **5.5. Information Access**

Access to information promotes its use, which in turn promotes attention to station care and maintenance, better data, and more use. An end-to-end view that extends from sensing to decision support is far preferable to isolated and disconnected activities and aids the support infrastructure that is ultimately so necessary for successful, long-term climate monitoring.

Decisions about improvements in monitoring capacity are facilitated greatly by the ability to examine available climate information. Various methods are being created at WRCC to improve access to that information. Web pages providing historic and ongoing climate data, and information from SWAN park units can be accessed at <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/nps>. In the event that this URL changes, there still will be links from the main WRCC Web page entitled “Projects” under NPS.

The WRCC has been steadily developing software to summarize data from hourly sites. This has been occurring under the aegis of the RAWS program and a growing array of product generators ranging from daily and monthly data lists to wind roses and hourly frequency distributions. All park data are available to park personnel via an access code (needed only for data listings) that can be acquired by request. The WRCC RAWS Web page is located at <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/wraws> or <http://www.raws.dri.edu>.

Web pages have been developed to provide access not only to historic and ongoing climate data and information from SWAN park units but also to climate-monitoring efforts for SWAN. These pages can be found through <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/nps>.

Additional access to more standard climate information is accessible through the previously mentioned Web pages, as well as through <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/summary>. These summaries are generally for COOP stations.

## **5.6. Summarized Conclusions and Recommendations**

- Weather and climate station coverage is sparse within large portions of SWAN park units.
- Redmond et al. (2005) identified candidate sites for new station installations in each of the SWAN park units. Several of these recommendations, along with additional sites, are being considered presently by SWAN (Giffen 2007). These include six sites in KATM and four sites in KEFJ.
- Site surveys in LACL will be completed during the next one or two field seasons.
- The lack of readily-available long-term records in and near SWAN park units highlights the necessity of maintaining observations at existing long-term stations.

## 6.0 Literature Cited

- Alaska Geographic Society. 1986. Lake Clark-Lake Iliamna Country. Vol. 13, No. 4, Anchorage, Alaska. pp. 16-45.
- American Association of State Climatologists. 1985. Heights and exposure standards for sensors on automated weather stations. *The State Climatologist* **9**.
- Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. 2004. Online. (<http://www.acia.uaf.edu>) Accessed 26 November 2004.
- Belland, R. J., and D. H. Vitt. 1995. Bryophyte vegetation patterns along environmental gradients in continental bogs. *Ecosystem* **2**:385-407.
- Bennett, A. J., W. L. Thompson, and D. C. Mortenson. 2005. Phase III report, vital signs monitoring plan, Southwest Alaska Network. National Park Service, Anchorage, Alaska.
- Bonan, G. B. 2002. *Ecological Climatology: Concepts and Applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brooks P. D., M. W. Williams, and S. K. Schmidt. 1998. Inorganic nitrogen and microbial biomass dynamics before and during spring snowmelt. *Biogeochemistry* **43**:1-15.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1997. Remote Automatic Weather Station (RAWS) and Remote Environmental Monitoring Systems (REMS) standards. RAWS/REMS Support Facility, Boise, Idaho.
- Chapin III, F. S., M. S. Torn, and M. Taten. 1996. Principles of ecosystem sustainability. *The American Naturalist* **148**:1016-1037.
- Daly, C., R. P. Neilson, and D. L. Phillips. 1994. A statistical-topographic model for mapping climatological precipitation over mountainous terrain. *Journal of Applied Meteorology* **33**:140-158.
- Daly, C., W. P. Gibson, G. H. Taylor, G. L. Johnson, and P. Pasteris. 2002. A knowledge-based approach to the statistical mapping of climate. *Climate Research* **22**:99-113.
- Doggett, M., C. Daly, J. Smith, W. Gibson, G. Taylor, G. Johnson, and P. Pasteris. 2004. High-resolution 1971-2000 mean monthly temperature maps for the western United States. Fourteenth AMS Conf. on Applied Climatology, 84<sup>th</sup> AMS Annual Meeting. Seattle, Washington, American Meteorological Society, Boston, Massachusetts, January 2004, Paper 4.3, CD-ROM.
- Environmental Protection Agency. 1987. On-site meteorological program guidance for regulatory modeling applications. EPA-450/4-87-013. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

- Finklin, A. I., and W. C. Fischer. 1990. Weather station handbook –an interagency guide for wildland managers. NFES No. 2140. National Wildfire Coordinating Group, Boise, Idaho.
- Gibson, W. P., C. Daly, T. Kittel, D. Nychka, C. Johns, N. Rosenbloom, A. McNab, and G. Taylor. 2002. Development of a 103-year high-resolution climate data set for the conterminous United States. Thirteenth AMS Conf. on Applied Climatology. Portland, Oregon, American Meteorological Society, Boston, MA, May 2002:181-183.
- Giffen, B. 2007. Climate Monitoring, National Park Service, Southwest Alaska Network. Online. ([http://www.nature.nps.gov/im/units/swan/Libraries/Presentations/Symposium2007/Presentations/15\\_GiffenB\\_2007\\_SWAN\\_ClimateMonitoring\\_20070307.pdf](http://www.nature.nps.gov/im/units/swan/Libraries/Presentations/Symposium2007/Presentations/15_GiffenB_2007_SWAN_ClimateMonitoring_20070307.pdf)) Accessed 2 June 2007.
- Groffman P. M., C. T. Driscoll, T. J. Fahey, J. P. Hardy, R. D. Fitzhugh, and G. L. Tierney. 2001. Effects of mild winter freezing on soil nitrogen and carbon dynamics in a northern hardwood forest. *Biogeochemistry* **56**:191-213.
- Hamilton, T. D., K. M. Reed, and R. M. Thorson. 1986. Glaciation in Alaska – Introduction and overview. Pages 1-8 *in* T. D. Hamilton, K. M. Reed, and R. M. Thorson, editors. *Glaciation in Alaska: The geologic record*. Alaska Geological Society, Anchorage, Alaska.
- Hannah, L., G. F. Midgley, and D. Millar. 2002. Climate change-integrated conservation strategies. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **11**:485-495.
- I&M. 2006. I&M Inventories home page. <http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/inventory/index.cfm>.
- Jacobson, M. C., R. J. Charlson, H. Rodhe, and G. H. Orians. 2000. *Earth System Science: From Biogeochemical Cycles to Global Change*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Karl, T. R., V. E. Derr, D. R. Easterling, C. K. Folland, D. J. Hoffman, S. Levitus, N. Nicholls, D. E. Parker, and G. W. Withee. 1996. Critical issues for long-term climate monitoring. Pages 55-92 *in* T. R. Karl, editor. *Long Term Climate Monitoring by the Global Climate Observing System*, Kluwer Publishing.
- Klein, W. H. 1957. Principal tracks and mean frequencies of cyclones and anticyclones in the Northern Hemisphere. U.S. Weather Bureau Research Paper No. 40.
- Mann, M. E., R. S. Bradley, and M. K. Hughes. 1998. Global-scale temperature patterns and climate forcing over the past six centuries. *Nature* **392**:779-787.
- Mantua, N. J., S. R. Hare, Y. Zhang, J. M. Wallace, and R. C. Francis. 1997. A Pacific interdecadal climate oscillation with impacts on salmon production. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **78**:1069-1079.

- Mantua, N. J. 2000. The Pacific Decadal Oscillation and climate forecasting for North America. Online. ([http://www.atmos.washington.edu/~mantua/REPORTS/PDO/PDO\\_cs.htm](http://www.atmos.washington.edu/~mantua/REPORTS/PDO/PDO_cs.htm)) Accessed 27 April 2004.
- Mantua, N. J. and S. R. Hare. 2002. The Pacific decadal oscillation. *Journal of Oceanography* **58**:35-44.
- National Assessment Synthesis Team. 2001. *Climate Change Impacts on the United States: The Potential Consequences of Climate Variability and Change, Report for the U.S. Global Change Research Program*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- National Park Service. 1983. *General management plan/development concept plan, Lake Clark National Park and Preserve, Alaska*. National Park Service, Denver, Colorado.
- National Park Service. 1999a. *Kenai Fjords National Park resource management plan*. National Park Service, Seward, Alaska.
- National Park Service. 1999b. *Weather observation data set 1990–1998, Aialik and Nuka bays, Kenai Fjords National Park*. National Park Service, Seward, Alaska.
- National Park Service. 1999c. *Resources management plan, Lake Clark National Park and Preserve. Draft revision to approved 1994 plan*. National Park Service, Anchorage, Alaska.
- National Research Council. 2001. *A Climate Services Vision: First Steps Toward the Future*. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.
- National Wildfire Coordinating Group. 2004. *National fire danger rating system weather station standards. Report PMS 426.3*. National Wildfire Coordinating Group, Boise, Idaho.
- Neilson, R. P. 1987. Biotic regionalization and climatic controls in western North America. *Vegetatio* **70**:135-147.
- Oakley, K. L., L. P. Thomas, and S. G. Fancy. 2003. *Guidelines for long-term monitoring protocols*. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* **31**:1000-1003.
- Redmond, K. T., D. B. Simeral, and G. D. McCurdy. 2005. *Climate monitoring for southwest Alaska national parks: network design and site selection. Report 05-01*. Western Regional Climate Center, Reno, Nevada.
- Redmond, K. T., and D. B. Simeral. 2006. *Weather and Climate Inventory, National Park Service, Central Alaska Network. Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/CAKN/NRTR—2006/004*. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Rodriguez-Iturbe, I. 2000. Ecohydrology: A hydrologic perspective of climate-soil-vegetation dynamics. *Water Resources Research* **36**:3-9.

- Schindler, D. W. 1997. Widespread effects of climatic warming on freshwater ecosystems in North America. *Hydrological Processes* **11**:1043-1067.
- Schlesinger, W. H. 1997. *Biogeochemistry: An Analysis of Global Change*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Selkregg, L. 1976. Alaska regional profiles: Southwest region. Alaska Environmental Information Data Center. University of Alaska.
- Sickman, J. O., A. Leydecker, C. C. Y. Chang, C. Kendall, J. M. Melack, D. M. Lucero, and J. Schimel. 2003. Mechanisms underlying export of N from high-elevation catchments during seasonal transitions. *Biogeochemistry* **64**:1-24.
- Simpson, J. J., G. L. Hufford, M. D. Fleming, J. S. Berg, and J. B. Aston. 2002. Long-term climate patterns in Alaskan surface temperature and precipitation and their biological consequences. *IEEE Trans. Geoscience and Remote Sensing* **40**:1164-1184.
- Tanner, B. D. 1990. Automated weather stations. *Remote Sensing Reviews* **5**:73-98.
- World Meteorological Organization. 1983. *Guide to meteorological instruments and methods of observation*, No. 8, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.
- World Meteorological Organization. 2005. *Organization and planning of intercomparisons of rainfall intensity gauges*. World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

## Appendix A. Glossary

**Climate**—Complete and entire ensemble of statistical descriptors of temporal and spatial properties comprising the behavior of the atmosphere. These descriptors include means, variances, frequency distributions, autocorrelations, spatial correlations and other patterns of association, temporal lags, and element-to-element relationships. The descriptors have a physical basis in flows and reservoirs of energy and mass. Climate and weather phenomena shade gradually into each other and are ultimately inseparable.

**Climate Element**—(same as Weather Element) Attribute or property of the state of the atmosphere that is measured, estimated, or derived. Examples of climate elements include temperature, wind speed, wind direction, precipitation amount, precipitation type, relative humidity, dewpoint, solar radiation, snow depth, soil temperature at a given depth, etc. A derived element is a function of other elements (like degree days or number of days with rain) and is not measured directly with a sensor. The terms “parameter” or “variable” are not used to describe elements.

**Climate Network**—Group of climate stations having a common purpose; the group is often owned and maintained by a single organization.

**Climate Station**—Station where data are collected to track atmospheric conditions over the long-term. Often, this station operates to additional standards to verify long-term consistency. For these stations, the detailed circumstances surrounding a set of measurements (siting and exposure, instrument changes, etc.) are important.

**Data**—Measurements specifying the state of the physical environment. Does not include metadata.

**Data Inventory**—Information about overall data properties for each station within a weather or climate network. A data inventory may include start/stop dates, percentages of available data, breakdowns by climate element, counts of actual data values, counts or fractions of data types, etc. These properties must be determined by actually reading the data and thus require the data to be available, accessible, and in a readable format.

**NPS I&M Network**—A set of NPS park units grouped by a common theme, typically by natural resource and/or geographic region.

**Metadata**—Information necessary to interpret environmental data properly, organized as a history or series of snapshots—data about data. Examples include details of measurement processes, station circumstances and exposures, assumptions about the site, network purpose and background, types of observations and sensors, pre-treatment of data, access information, maintenance history and protocols, observational methods, archive locations, owner, and station start/end period.

**Quality Assurance**—Planned and systematic set of activities to provide adequate confidence that products and services are resulting in credible and correct information. Includes quality control.

**Quality Control**—Evaluation, assessment, and improvement of imperfect data by utilizing other imperfect data.

**Station Inventory**—Information about a set of stations obtained from metadata that accompany the network or networks. A station inventory can be compiled from direct and indirect reports prepared by others.

**Weather**—Instantaneous state of the atmosphere at any given time, mainly with respect to its effects on biological activities. As distinguished from climate, weather consists of the short-term (minutes to days) variations in the atmosphere. Popularly, weather is thought of in terms of temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind, sky condition, visibility, and cloud conditions.

**Weather Element** (same as Climate Element)—Attribute or property of the state of the atmosphere that is measured, estimated, or derived. Examples of weather elements include temperature, wind speed, wind direction, precipitation amount, precipitation type, relative humidity, dewpoint, solar radiation, snow depth, soil temperature at a given depth, etc. A derived weather element is a function of other elements (like degree days or number of days with rain) and is not measured directly. The terms “parameter” and “variable” are not used to describe weather elements.

**Weather Network**—Group of weather stations usually owned and maintained by a particular organization and usually for a specific purpose.

**Weather Station**—Station where collected data are intended for near-real-time use with less need for reference to long-term conditions. In many cases, the detailed circumstances of a set of measurements (siting and exposure, instrument changes, etc.) from weather stations are not as important as for climate stations.

## Appendix B. Climate-monitoring principles

Since the late 1990s, frequent references have been made to a set of climate-monitoring principles enunciated in 1996 by Tom Karl, director of the NOAA NCDC in Asheville, North Carolina. These monitoring principles also have been referred to informally as the “Ten Commandments of Climate Monitoring.” Both versions are given here. In addition, these principles have been adopted by the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS 2004).

(Compiled by Kelly Redmond, Western Regional Climate Center, Desert Research Institute, August 2000.)

### **B.1. Full Version (Karl et al. 1996)**

**B.1.1.** Effects on climate records of instrument changes, observing practices, observation locations, sampling rates, etc., must be known before such changes are implemented. This can be ascertained through a period where overlapping measurements from old and new observing systems are collected or sometimes by comparing the old and new observing systems with a reference standard. Site stability for in situ measurements, both in terms of physical location and changes in the nearby environment, also should be a key criterion in site selection. Thus, many synoptic network stations, which are primarily used in weather forecasting but also provide valuable climate data, and dedicated climate stations intended to be operational for extended periods must be subject to this policy.

**B.1.2.** Processing algorithms and changes in these algorithms must be well documented. Documentation should be carried with the data throughout the data-archiving process.

**B.1.3.** Knowledge of instrument, station, and/or platform history is essential for interpreting and using the data. Changes in instrument sampling time, local environmental conditions for in situ measurements, and other factors pertinent to interpreting the observations and measurements should be recorded as a mandatory part in the observing routine and be archived with the original data.

**B.1.4.** In situ and other observations with a long, uninterrupted record should be maintained. Every effort should be applied to protect the data sets that have provided long-term, homogeneous observations. “Long-term” for space-based measurements is measured in decades, but for more conventional measurements, “long-term” may be a century or more. Each element in the observational system should develop a list of prioritized sites or observations based on their contribution to long-term climate monitoring.

**B.1.5.** Calibration, validation, and maintenance facilities are critical requirements for long-term climatic data sets. Homogeneity in the climate record must be assessed routinely, and corrective action must become part of the archived record.

**B.1.6.** Where feasible, some level of “low-technology” backup to “high-technology” observing systems should be developed to safeguard against unexpected operational failures.

**B.1.7.** Regions having insufficient data, variables and regions sensitive to change, and key

measurements lacking adequate spatial and temporal resolution should be given the highest priority in designing and implementing new climate-observing systems.

**B.1.8.** Network designers and instrument engineers must receive long-term climate requirements at the outset of the network design process. This is particularly important because most observing systems have been designed for purposes other than long-term climate monitoring. Instruments must possess adequate accuracy with biases small enough to document climate variations and changes.

**B.1.9.** Much of the development of new observational capabilities and the evidence supporting the value of these observations stem from research-oriented needs or programs. A lack of stable, long-term commitment to these observations and lack of a clear transition plan from research to operations are two frequent limitations in the development of adequate, long-term monitoring capabilities. Difficulties in securing a long-term commitment must be overcome in order to improve the climate-observing system in a timely manner with minimal interruptions.

**B.1.10.** Data management systems that facilitate access, use, and interpretation are essential. Freedom of access, low cost, mechanisms that facilitate use (directories, catalogs, browse capabilities, availability of metadata on station histories, algorithm accessibility and documentation, etc.) and quality control should guide data management. International cooperation is critical for successful management of data used to monitor long-term climate change and variability.

## **B.2. Abbreviated version, “Ten Commandments of Climate Monitoring”**

**B.2.1.** Assess the impact of new climate-observing systems or changes to existing systems before they are implemented.

“Thou shalt properly manage network change.” (assess effects of proposed changes)

**B.2.2.** Require a suitable period where measurement from new and old climate-observing systems will overlap.

“Thou shalt conduct parallel testing.” (compare old and replacement systems)

**B.2.3.** Treat calibration, validation, algorithm-change, and data-homogeneity assessments with the same care as the data.

“Thou shalt collect metadata.” (fully document system and operating procedures)

**B.2.4.** Verify capability for routinely assessing the quality and homogeneity of the data including high-resolution data for extreme events.

“Thou shalt assure data quality and continuity.” (assess as part of routine operating procedures)

**B.2.5.** Integrate assessments like those conducted by the International Panel on Climate Change into global climate-observing priorities.

“Thou shalt anticipate the use of data.” (integrated environmental assessment; component in operational plan for system)

**B.2.6.** Maintain long-term weather and climate stations.

“Thou shalt worship historic significance.” (maintain homogeneous data sets from long-term, climate-observing systems)

**B.2.7.** Place high priority on increasing observations in regions lacking sufficient data and in regions sensitive to change and variability.

"Thou shalt acquire complementary data." (new sites to fill observational gaps)

**B.2.8.** Provide network operators, designers, and instrument engineers with long-term requirements at the outset of the design and implementation phases for new systems.

“Thou shalt specify requirements for climate observation systems.” (application and usage of observational data)

**B.2.9.** Carefully consider the transition from research-observing system to long-term operation.

“Thou shalt have continuity of purpose.” (stable long-term commitments)

**B.2.10.** Focus on data-management systems that facilitate access, use, and interpretation of weather data and metadata.

“Thou shalt provide access to data and metadata.” (readily available weather and climate information)

### **B.3. Literature Cited**

Karl, T. R., V. E. Derr, D. R. Easterling, C. K. Folland, D. J. Hoffman, S. Levitus, N. Nicholls, D. E. Parker, and G. W. Withee. 1996. Critical Issues for Long-Term Climate Monitoring. Pages 55-92 in T. R. Karl, editor. Long Term Climate Monitoring by the Global Climate Observing System, Kluwer Publishing.

Global Climate Observing System. 2004. Implementation Plan for the Global Observing System for Climate in Support of the UNFCCC. GCOS-92, WMO/TD No. 1219, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

# Appendix C. Factors in operating a weather/ climate network

## C.1. Climate versus Weather

- Climate measurements require *consistency through time*.

## C.2. Network Purpose

- Anticipated or desired lifetime.
- Breadth of network mission (commitment by needed constituency).
- Dedicated constituency—no network survives without a dedicated constituency.

## C.3. Site Identification and Selection

- Spanning gradients in climate or biomes with transects.
- Issues regarding representative spatial scale—site uniformity versus site clustering.
- Alignment with and contribution to network mission.
- Exposure—ability to measure representative quantities.
- Logistics—ability to service station (Always or only in favorable weather?).
- Site redundancy (positive for quality control, negative for extra resources).
- Power—is AC needed?
- Site security—is protection from vandalism needed?
- Permitting often a major impediment and usually underestimated.

## C.4. Station Hardware

- Survival—weather is the main cause of lost weather/climate data.
- Robustness of sensors—ability to measure and record in any condition.
- Quality—distrusted records are worthless and a waste of time and money.
  - High quality—will cost up front but pays off later.
  - Low quality—may provide a lower start-up cost but will cost more later (low cost can be expensive).
- Redundancy—backup if sensors malfunction.
- Ice and snow—measurements are much more difficult than rain measurements.
- Severe environments (expense is about two–three times greater than for stations in more benign settings).

## C.5. Communications

- Reliability—live data have a much larger constituency.
- One-way or two-way.
  - Retrieval of missed transmissions.
  - Ability to reprogram data logger remotely.
  - Remote troubleshooting abilities.
  - Continuing versus one-time costs.
- Back-up procedures to prevent data loss during communication outages.
- Live communications increase problems but also increase value.

## C.6. Maintenance

- Main reason why networks fail (and most networks do eventually fail!).
- Key issue with nearly every network.
- Who will perform maintenance?
- Degree of commitment and motivation to contribute.
- Periodic? On-demand as needed? Preventive?
- Equipment change-out schedules and upgrades for sensors and software.
- Automated stations require skilled and experienced labor.
- Calibration—sensors often drift (climate).
- Site maintenance essential (constant vegetation, surface conditions, nearby influences).
- Typical automated station will cost about \$2K per year to maintain.
- Documentation—photos, notes, visits, changes, essential for posterity.
- Planning for equipment life cycle and technological advances.

## C.7. Maintaining Programmatic Continuity and Corporate Knowledge

- Long-term vision and commitment needed.
- Institutionalizing versus personalizing—developing appropriate dependencies.

## C.8. Data Flow

- Centralized ingest?
- Centralized access to data and data products?
- Local version available?
- Contract out work or do it yourself?
- Quality control of data.
- Archival.
- Metadata—historic information, not a snapshot. Every station should collect metadata.
- Post-collection processing, multiple data-ingestion paths.

## C.9. Products

- Most basic product consists of the data values.
- Summaries.
- Write own applications or leverage existing mechanisms?

## C.10. Funding

- Prototype approaches as proof of concept.
- Linking and leveraging essential.
- Constituencies—every network needs a constituency.
- Bridging to practical and operational communities? Live data needed.
- Bridging to counterpart research efforts and initiatives—funding source.
- Creativity, resourcefulness, and persistence usually are essential to success.

### **C.11. Final Comments**

- Deployment is by far the easiest part in operating a network.
- Maintenance is the main issue.
- Best analogy: Operating a network is like raising a child; it requires constant attention.

Source: Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC)

## **Appendix D. General design considerations for weather/ climate-monitoring programs**

The process for designing a climate-monitoring program benefits from anticipating design and protocol issues discussed here. Much of this material is been excerpted from a report addressing the Channel Islands National Park (Redmond and McCurdy 2005), where an example is found illustrating how these factors can be applied to a specific setting. Many national park units possess some climate or meteorology feature that sets them apart from more familiar or “standard” settings.

### **D.1. Introduction**

There are several criteria that must be used in deciding to deploy new stations and where these new stations should be sited.

- Where are existing stations located?
- Where have data been gathered in the past (discontinued locations)?
- Where would a new station fill a knowledge gap about basic, long-term climatic averages for an area of interest?
- Where would a new station fill a knowledge gap about how climate behaves over time?
- As a special case for behavior over time, what locations might be expected to show a more sensitive response to climate change?
- How do answers to the preceding questions depend on the climate element? Are answers the same for precipitation, temperature, wind, snowfall, humidity, etc.?
- What role should manual measurements play? How should manual measurements interface with automated measurements?
- Are there special technical or management issues, either present or anticipated in the next 5–15 years, requiring added climate information?
- What unique information is provided in addition to information from existing sites? “Redundancy is bad.”
- What nearby information is available to estimate missing observations because observing systems always experience gaps and lose data? “Redundancy is good.”
- How would logistics and maintenance affect these decisions?

In relation to the preceding questions, there are several topics that should be considered. The following topics are not listed in a particular order.

#### ***D.1.1. Network Purpose***

Humans seem to have an almost reflexive need to measure temperature and precipitation, along with other climate elements. These reasons span a broad range from utilitarian to curiosity-driven. Although there are well-known recurrent patterns of need and data use, new uses are always appearing. The number of uses ranges in the thousands. Attempts have been made to categorize such uses (see NRC 1998; 2001). Because climate measurements are accumulated over a long time, they should be treated as multi-purpose and should be undertaken in a manner that serves the widest possible applications. Some applications remain constant, while others rise and fall in importance. An insistent issue today may subside, while the next pressing issue of tomorrow barely may be anticipated. The notion that humans might affect the climate of the

entire Earth was nearly unimaginable when the national USDA (later NOAA) cooperative weather network began in the late 1800s. Abundant experience has shown, however, that there always will be a demand for a history record of climate measurements and their properties. Experience also shows that there is an expectation that climate measurements will be taken and made available to the general public.

An exhaustive list of uses for data would fill many pages and still be incomplete. In broad terms, however, there are needs to document environmental conditions that disrupt or otherwise affect park operations (e.g., storms and droughts). Design and construction standards are determined by climatological event frequencies that exceed certain thresholds. Climate is a determinant that sometimes attracts and sometimes discourages visitors. Climate may play a large part in the park experience (e.g., Death Valley and heat are nearly synonymous). Some park units are large enough to encompass spatial or elevation diversity in climate and the sequence of events can vary considerably inside or close to park boundaries. That is, temporal trends and statistics may not be the same everywhere, and this spatial structure should be sampled. The granularity of this structure depends on the presence of topography or large climate gradients or both, such as that found along the U.S. West Coast in summer with the rapid transition from the marine layer to the hot interior.

Plant and animal communities and entire ecosystems react to every nuance in the physical environment. No aspect of weather and climate goes undetected in the natural world. Wilson (1998) proposed “an informal rule of biological evolution” that applies here: “If an organic sensor can be imagined that is capable of detecting any particular environmental signal, a species exists somewhere that possesses this sensor.” Every weather and climate event, whether dull or extraordinary to humans, matters to some organism. Dramatic events and creeping incremental change both have consequences to living systems. Extreme events or disturbances can “reset the clock” or “shake up the system” and lead to reverberations that last for years to centuries or longer. Slow change can carry complex nonlinear systems (e.g., any living assemblage) into states where chaotic transitions and new behavior occur. These changes are seldom predictable, typically are observed after the fact, and understood only in retrospect. Climate changes may not be exciting, but as a well-known atmospheric scientist, Mike Wallace, from the University of Washington once noted, “subtle does not mean unimportant.”

Thus, individuals who observe the climate should be able to record observations accurately and depict both rapid and slow changes. In particular, an array of artificial influences easily can confound detection of slow changes. The record as provided can contain both real climate variability (that took place in the atmosphere) and fake climate variability (that arose directly from the way atmospheric changes were observed and recorded). As an example, trees growing near a climate station with an excellent anemometer will make it appear that the wind gradually slowed down over many years. Great care must be taken to protect against sources of fake climate variability on the longer-time scales of years to decades. Processes leading to the observed climate are not stationary; rather these processes draw from probability distributions that vary with time. For this reason, climatic time series do not exhibit statistical stationarity. The implications are manifold. There are no true climatic “normals” to which climate inevitably must return. Rather, there are broad ranges of climatic conditions. Climate does not demonstrate exact repetition but instead continual fluctuation and sometimes approximate repetition. In addition,

there is always new behavior waiting to occur. Consequently, the business of climate monitoring is never finished, and there is no point where we can state confidently that “enough” is known.

### ***D.1.2. Robustness***

The most frequent cause for loss of weather data is the weather itself, the very thing we wish to record. The design of climate and weather observing programs should consider the meteorological equivalent of “peaking power” employed by utilities. Because environmental disturbances have significant effects on ecologic systems, sensors, data loggers, and communications networks should be able to function during the most severe conditions that realistically can be anticipated over the next 50–100 years. Systems designed in this manner are less likely to fail under more ordinary conditions, as well as more likely to transmit continuous, quality data for both tranquil and active periods.

### ***D.1.3. Weather versus Climate***

For “weather” measurements, pertaining to what is approximately happening here and now, small moves and changes in exposure are not as critical. For “climate” measurements, where values from different points in time are compared, siting and exposure are critical factors, and it is vitally important that the observing circumstances remain essentially unchanged over the duration of the station record.

Station moves can affect different elements to differing degrees. Even small moves of several meters, especially vertically, can affect temperature records. Hills and knolls act differently from the bottoms of small swales, pockets, or drainage channels (Whiteman 2000; Geiger et al. 2003). Precipitation is probably less subject to change with moves of 50–100 m than other elements (that is, precipitation has less intrinsic variation in small spaces) except if wind flow over the gauge is affected.

### ***D.1.4. Physical Setting***

Siting and exposure, and their continuity and consistency through time, significantly influence the climate records produced by a station. These two terms have overlapping connotations. We use the term “siting” in a more general sense, reserving the term “exposure” generally for the particular circumstances affecting the ability of an instrument to record measurements that are representative of the desired spatial or temporal scale.

### ***D.1.5. Measurement Intervals***

Climatic processes occur continuously in time, but our measurement systems usually record in discrete chunks of time: for example, seconds, hours, or days. These measurements often are referred to as “systematic” measurements. Interval averages may hide active or interesting periods of highly intense activity. Alternatively, some systems record “events” when a certain threshold of activity is exceeded (examples: another millimeter of precipitation has fallen, another kilometer of wind has moved past, the temperature has changed by a degree, a gust higher than 9.9 m/s has been measured). When this occurs, measurements from all sensors are reported. These measurements are known as “breakpoint” data. In relatively unchanging conditions (long calm periods or rainless weeks, for example), event recorders should send a signal that they are still “alive and well.” If systematic recorders are programmed to note and periodically report the highest, lowest, and mean value within each time interval, the likelihood

is reduced that interesting behavior will be glossed over or lost. With the capacity of modern data loggers, it is recommended to record and report extremes within the basic time increment (e.g., hourly or 10 minutes). This approach also assists quality-control procedures.

There is usually a trade-off between data volume and time increment, and most automated systems now are set to record approximately hourly. A number of field stations maintained by WRCC are programmed to record in 5- or 10-minute increments, which readily serve to construct an hourly value. However, this approach produces 6–12 times as much data as hourly data. These systems typically do not record details of events at sub-interval time scales, but they easily can record peak values, or counts of threshold exceedance, within the time intervals.

Thus, for each time interval at an automated station, we recommend that several kinds of information—mean or sum, extreme maximum and minimum, and sometimes standard deviation—be recorded. These measurements are useful for quality control and other purposes. Modern data loggers and office computers have quite high capacity. Diagnostic information indicating the state of solar chargers or battery voltages and their extremes is of great value. This topic will be discussed in greater detail in a succeeding section.

Automation also has made possible adaptive or intelligent monitoring techniques where systems vary the recording rate based on detection of the behavior of interest by the software. Sub-interval behavior of interest can be masked on occasion (e.g., a 5-minute extreme downpour with high-erosive capability hidden by an innocuous hourly total). Most users prefer measurements that are systematic in time because they are much easier to summarize and manipulate.

For breakpoint data produced by event reporters, there also is a need to send periodically a signal that the station is still functioning, even though there is nothing more to report. “No report” does not necessarily mean “no data,” and it is important to distinguish between the actual observation that was recorded and the content of that observation (e.g., an observation of “0.00” is not the same as “no observation”).

#### ***D.1.6. Mixed Time Scales***

There are times when we may wish to combine information from radically different scales. For example, over the past 100 years we may want to know how the frequency of 5-minute precipitation peaks has varied or how the frequency of peak 1-second wind gusts have varied. We may also want to know over this time if nearby vegetation gradually has grown up to increasingly block the wind or to slowly improve precipitation catch. Answers to these questions require knowledge over a wide range of time scales.

#### ***D.1.7. Elements***

For manual measurements, the typical elements recorded included temperature extremes, precipitation, and snowfall/snow depth. Automated measurements typically include temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind speed and direction, and solar radiation. An exception to this exists in very windy locations where precipitation is difficult to measure accurately. Automated measurements of snow are improving, but manual measurements are still preferable, as long as shielding is present. Automated measurement of frozen precipitation presents numerous challenges that have not been resolved fully, and the best gauges are quite expensive (\$3–8K).

Soil temperatures also are included sometimes. Soil moisture is extremely useful, but measurements are not made at many sites. In addition, care must be taken in the installation and maintenance of instruments used in measuring soil moisture. Soil properties vary tremendously in short distances as well, and it is often very difficult (“impossible”) to accurately document these variations (without digging up all the soil!). In cooler climates, ultrasonic sensors that detect snow depth are becoming commonplace.

#### **D.1.8. Wind Standards**

Wind varies the most in the shortest distance, since it always decreases to zero near the ground and increases rapidly (approximately logarithmically) with height near the ground. Changes in anemometer height obviously will affect distribution of wind speed as will changes in vegetation, obstructions such as buildings, etc. A site that has a 3-m (10-ft) mast clearly will be less windy than a site that has a 6-m (20-ft) or 10-m (33-ft) mast. Historically, many U.S. airports (FAA and NWS) and most current RAWS sites have used a standard 6-m (20-ft) mast for wind measurements. Some NPS RAWS sites utilize shorter masts. Over the last decade, as Automated Surface Observing Systems (ASOSs, mostly NWS) and Automated Weather Observing Systems (AWOSs, mostly FAA) have been deployed at most airports, wind masts have been raised to 8 or 10 m (26 or 33 ft), depending on airplane clearance. The World Meteorological Organization recommends 10 m as the height for wind measurements (WMO 1983; 2005), and more groups are migrating slowly to this standard. The American Association of State Climatologists (AASC 1985) have recommended that wind be measured at 3 m, a standard geared more for agricultural applications than for general purpose uses where higher levels usually are preferred. Different anemometers have different starting thresholds; therefore, areas that frequently experience very light winds may not produce wind measurements thus affecting long-term mean estimates of wind speed. For both sustained winds (averages over a short interval of 2–60 minutes) and especially for gusts, the duration of the sampling interval makes a considerable difference. For the same wind history, 1-second gusts are higher than gusts averaging 3 seconds, which in turn are greater than 5-second averages, so that the same sequence would be described with different numbers (all three systems and more are in use). Changes in the averaging procedure, or in height or exposure, can lead to “false” or “fake” climate change with no change in actual climate. Changes in any of these should be noted in the metadata.

#### **D.1.9. Wind Nomenclature**

Wind is a vector quantity having a direction and a speed. Directions can be two- or three-dimensional; they will be three-dimensional if the vertical component is important. In all common uses, winds always are denoted by the direction they blow *from* (north wind or southerly breeze). This convention exists because wind often brings weather, and thus our attention is focused upstream. However, this approach contrasts with the way ocean currents are viewed. Ocean currents usually are denoted by the direction they are moving *towards* (eastward current moves from west to east). In specialized applications (such as in atmospheric modeling), wind velocity vectors point in the direction that the wind is blowing. Thus, a southwesterly wind (from the southwest) has both northward and eastward (to the north and to the east) components. Except near mountains, wind cannot blow up or down near the ground, so the vertical component of wind often is approximated as zero, and the horizontal component is emphasized.

#### ***D.1.10. Frozen Precipitation***

Frozen precipitation is more difficult to measure than liquid precipitation, especially with automated techniques. Sevruk and Harmon (1984), Goodison et al. (1998), and Yang et al. (1998; 2001) provide many of the reasons to explain this. The importance of frozen precipitation varies greatly from one setting to another. This subject was discussed in greater detail in a related inventory and monitoring report for the Alaska park units (Redmond et al. 2005).

In climates that receive frozen precipitation, a decision must be made whether or not to try to record such events accurately. This usually means that the precipitation must be turned into liquid either by falling into an antifreeze fluid solution that is then weighed or by heating the precipitation enough to melt and fall through a measuring mechanism such as a nearly-balanced tipping bucket. Accurate measurements from the first approach require expensive gauges; tipping buckets can achieve this resolution readily but are more apt to lose some or all precipitation. Improvements have been made to the heating mechanism on the NWS tipping-bucket gauge used for the ASOS to correct its numerous deficiencies making it less problematic; however, this gauge is not inexpensive. A heat supply needed to melt frozen precipitation usually requires more energy than renewable energy (solar panels or wind recharging) can provide thus AC power is needed. Periods of frozen precipitation or rime often provide less-than-optimal recharging conditions with heavy clouds, short days, low-solar-elevation angles and more horizon blocking, and cold temperatures causing additional drain on the battery.

#### ***D.1.11. Save or Lose***

A second consideration with precipitation is determining if the measurement should be saved (as in weighing systems) or lost (as in tipping-bucket systems). With tipping buckets, after the water has passed through the tipping mechanism, it usually just drops to the ground. Thus, there is no checksum to ensure that the sum of all the tips adds up to what has been saved in a reservoir at some location. By contrast, the weighing gauges continually accumulate until the reservoir is emptied, the reported value is the total reservoir content (for example, the height of the liquid column in a tube), and the incremental precipitation is the difference in depth between two known times. These weighing gauges do not always have the same fine resolution. Some gauges only record to the nearest centimeter, which is usually acceptable for hydrology but not necessarily for other needs. (For reference, a millimeter of precipitation can get a person in street clothes quite wet.) Other weighing gauges are capable of measuring to the 0.25-mm (0.01-in.) resolution but do not have as much capacity and must be emptied more often. Day/night and storm-related thermal expansion and contraction and sometimes wind shaking can cause fluid pressure from accumulated totals to go up and down in SNOTEL gauges by small increments (commonly 0.3-3 cm, or 0.01–0.10 ft) leading to “negative precipitation” followed by similarly non-real light precipitation when, in fact, no change took place in the amount of accumulated precipitation.

#### ***D.1.12. Time***

Time should always be in local standard time (LST), and daylight savings time (DST) should never be used under any circumstances with automated equipment and timers. Using DST leads to one duplicate hour, one missing hour, and a season of displaced values, as well as needless confusion and a data-management nightmare. Absolute time, such as Greenwich Mean Time (GMT) or Coordinated Universal Time (UTC), also can be used because these formats are

unambiguously translatable. Since measurements only provide information about what already *has* occurred or *is* occurring and not what *will* occur, they should always be assigned to the *ending time* of the associated interval with hour 24 marking the end of the last hour of the day. In this system, midnight always represents the end of the day, not the start. To demonstrate the importance of this differentiation, we have encountered situations where police officers seeking corroborating weather data could not recall whether the time on their crime report from a year ago was the starting midnight or the ending midnight! Station positions should be known to within a few meters, easily accomplished with GPS (Global Positioning System), so that time zones and solar angles can be determined accurately.

#### ***D.1.13. Automated versus Manual***

Most of this report has addressed automated measurements. Historically, most measurements are manual and typically collected once a day. In many cases, manual measurements continue because of habit, usefulness, and desire for continuity over time. Manual measurements are extremely useful and when possible should be encouraged. However, automated measurements are becoming more common. For either, it is important to record time in a logically consistent manner.

It should not be automatically assumed that newer data and measurements are “better” than older data or that manual data are “worse” than automated data. Older or simpler manual measurements are often of very high quality even if they sometimes are not in the most convenient digital format.

There is widespread desire to use automated systems to reduce human involvement. This is admirable and understandable, but every automated weather/climate station or network requires significant human attention and maintenance. A telling example concerns the Oklahoma Mesonet (see Brock et al. 1995, and bibliography at <http://www.mesonet.ou.edu>), a network of about 115 high-quality, automated meteorological stations spread over Oklahoma, where about 80 percent of the annual (\$2–3M) budget is nonetheless allocated to humans with only about 20 percent allocated to equipment.

#### ***D.1.14. Manual Conventions***

Manual measurements typically are made once a day. Elements usually consist of maximum and minimum temperature, temperature at observation time, precipitation, snowfall, snow depth, and sometimes evaporation, wind, or other information. Since it is not actually known when extremes occurred, the only logical approach, and the nationwide convention, is to ascribe the entire measurement to the time-interval date and to enter it on the form in that way. For morning observers (for example, 8 am to 8 am), this means that the maximum temperature written for today often is from yesterday afternoon and sometimes the minimum temperature for the 24-hr period actually occurred yesterday morning. However, this is understood and expected. It is often a surprise to observers to see how many maximum temperatures do not occur in the afternoon and how many minimum temperatures do not occur in the predawn hours. This is especially true in environments that are colder, higher, northerly, cloudy, mountainous, or coastal. As long as this convention is strictly followed every day, it has been shown that truly excellent climate records can result (Redmond 1992). Manual observers should reset equipment only one time per day at the official observing time. Making more than one measurement a day is discouraged

strongly; this practice results in a hybrid record that is too difficult to interpret. The only exception is for total daily snowfall. New snowfall can be measured up to four times per day with no observations closer than six hours. It is well known that more frequent measurement of snow increases the annual total because compaction is a continuous process.

Two main purposes for climate observations are to establish the long-term averages for given locations and to track variations in climate. Broadly speaking, these purposes address topics of absolute and relative climate behavior. Once absolute behavior has been “established” (a task that is never finished because long-term averages continue to vary in time)—temporal variability quickly becomes the item of most interest.

## **D.2. Representativeness**

Having discussed important factors to consider when new sites are installed, we now turn our attention to site “representativeness.” In popular usage, we often encounter the notion that a site is “representative” of another site if it receives the same annual precipitation or records the same annual temperature or if some other element-specific, long-term average has a similar value. This notion of representativeness has a certain limited validity, but there are other aspects of this idea that need to be considered.

A climate monitoring site also can be said to be representative if climate records from that site show sufficiently strong temporal correlations with a large number of locations over a sufficiently large area. If station A receives 20 cm a year and station B receives 200 cm a year, these climates obviously receive quite differing amounts of precipitation. However, if their monthly, seasonal, or annual correlations are high (for example, 0.80 or higher for a particular time scale), one site can be used as a surrogate for estimating values at the other if measurements for a particular month, season, or year are missing. That is, a wet or dry month at one station is also a wet or dry month (relative to its own mean) at the comparison station. Note that high correlations on one time scale do not imply automatically that high correlations will occur on other time scales.

Likewise, two stations having similar mean climates (for example, similar annual precipitation) might not co-vary in close synchrony (for example, coastal versus interior). This may be considered a matter of climate “affiliation” for a particular location.

Thus, the representativeness of a site can refer either to the basic climatic averages for a given duration (or time window within the annual cycle) or to the extent that the site co-varies in time with respect to all surrounding locations. One site can be representative of another in the first sense but not the second, or vice versa, or neither, or both—all combinations are possible.

If two sites are perfectly correlated then, in a sense, they are “redundant.” However, redundancy has value because all sites will experience missing data especially with automated equipment in rugged environments and harsh climates where outages and other problems nearly can be guaranteed. In many cases, those outages are caused by the weather, particularly by unusual weather and the very conditions we most wish to know about. Methods for filling in those values will require proxy information from this or other nearby networks. Thus, redundancy is a virtue rather than a vice.

In general, the cooperative stations managed by the NWS have produced much longer records than automated stations like RAWS or SNOTEL stations. The RAWS stations often have problems with precipitation, especially in winter, or with missing data, so that low correlations may be data problems rather than climatic dissimilarity. The RAWS records also are relatively short, so correlations should be interpreted with care. In performing and interpreting such analyses, however, we must remember that there are physical climate reasons and observational reasons why stations within a short distance (even a few tens or hundreds of meters) may not correlate well.

### ***D.2.1. Temporal Behavior***

It is possible that high correlations will occur between station pairs during certain portions of the year (i.e., January) but low correlations may occur during other portions of the year (e.g., September or October). The relative contributions of these seasons to the annual total (for precipitation) or average (for temperature) and the correlations for each month are both factors in the correlation of an aggregated time window of longer duration that encompasses those seasons (e.g., one of the year definitions such as calendar year or water year). A complete and careful evaluation ideally would include such a correlation analysis but requires more resources and data. Note that it also is possible and frequently is observed that temperatures are highly correlated while precipitation is not or vice versa, and these relations can change according to the time of year. If two stations are well correlated for all climate elements for all portions of the year, then they can be considered redundant.

With scarce resources, the initial strategy should be to try to identify locations that do not correlate particularly well, so that each new site measures something new that cannot be guessed easily from the behavior of surrounding sites. (An important caveat here is that lack of such correlation could be a result of physical climate behavior and not a result of faults with the actual measuring process; i.e., by unrepresentative or simply poor-quality data. Unfortunately, we seldom have perfect climate data.) As additional sites are added, we usually wish for some combination of unique and redundant sites to meet what amounts to essentially orthogonal constraints: new information and more reliably-furnished information.

A common consideration is whether to observe on a ridge or in a valley, given the resources to place a single station within a particular area of a few square kilometers. Ridge and valley stations will correlate very well for temperatures when lapse conditions prevail, particularly summer daytime temperatures. In summer at night or winter at daylight, the picture will be more mixed and correlations will be lower. In winter at night when inversions are common and even the rule, correlations may be zero or even negative and perhaps even more divergent as the two sites are on opposite sides of the inversion. If we had the luxury of locating stations everywhere, we would find that ridge tops generally correlate very well with other ridge tops and similarly valleys with other valleys, but ridge tops correlate well with valleys only under certain circumstances. Beyond this, valleys and ridges having similar orientations usually will correlate better with each other than those with perpendicular orientations, depending on their orientation with respect to large-scale wind flow and solar angles.

Unfortunately, we do not have stations everywhere, so we are forced to use the few comparisons that we have and include a large dose of intelligent reasoning, using what we have observed

elsewhere. In performing and interpreting such analyses, we must remember that there are physical climatic reasons and observational reasons why stations within a short distance (even a few tens or hundreds of meters) may not correlate well.

Examples of correlation analyses include those for the Channel Islands and for southwest Alaska, which can be found in Redmond and McCurdy (2005) and Redmond et al. (2005). These examples illustrate what can be learned from correlation analyses. Spatial correlations generally vary by time of year. Thus, results should be displayed in the form of annual correlation cycles—for monthly mean temperature and monthly total precipitation and perhaps other climate elements like wind or humidity—between station pairs selected for climatic setting and data availability and quality.

In general, the COOP stations managed by the NWS have produced much longer records than have automated stations like RAWS or SNOTEL stations. The RAWS stations also often have problems with precipitation, especially in winter or with missing data, so that low correlations may be data problems rather than climate dissimilarity. The RAWS records are much shorter, so correlations should be interpreted with care, but these stations are more likely to be in places of interest for remote or under-sampled regions.

### ***D.2.2. Spatial Behavior***

A number of techniques exist to interpolate from isolated point values to a spatial domain. For example, a common technique is simple inverse distance weighting. Critical to the success of the simplest of such techniques is that some other property of the spatial domain, one that is influential for the mapped element, does not vary significantly. Topography greatly influences precipitation, temperature, wind, humidity, and most other meteorological elements. Thus, this criterion clearly is not met in any region having extreme topographic diversity. In such circumstances, simple Cartesian distance may have little to do with how rapidly correlation deteriorates from one site to the next, and in fact, the correlations can decrease readily from a mountain to a valley and then increase again on the next mountain. Such structure in the fields of spatial correlation is not seen in the relatively (statistically) well-behaved flat areas like those in the eastern U.S.

To account for dominating effects such as topography and inland–coastal differences that exist in certain regions, some kind of additional knowledge must be brought to bear to produce meaningful, physically plausible, and observationally based interpolations. Historically, this has proven to be an extremely difficult problem, especially to perform objective and repeatable analyses. An analysis performed for southwest Alaska (Redmond et al. 2005) concluded that the PRISM maps (Daly et al. 1994; 2002; Gibson et al. 2002; Doggett et al. 2004) were probably the best available. An analysis by Simpson et al. (2005) further discussed many issues in the mapping of Alaska’s climate and resulted in the same conclusion about PRISM.

### ***D.2.3. Climate-Change Detection***

Although general purpose climate stations should be situated to address all aspects of climate variability, it is desirable that they also be in locations that are more sensitive to climate change from natural or anthropogenic influences should it begin to occur. The question here is how well

we know such sensitivities. The climate-change issue is quite complex because it encompasses more than just greenhouse gasses.

Sites that are in locations or climates particularly vulnerable to climate change should be favored. How this vulnerability is determined is a considerably challenging research issue. Candidate locations or situations are those that lie on the border between two major biomes or just inside the edge of one or the other. In these cases, a slight movement of the boundary in anticipated direction (toward “warmer,” for example) would be much easier to detect as the boundary moves past the site and a different set of biota begin to be established. Such a vegetative or ecologic response would be more visible and would take less time to establish as a real change than would a smaller change in the center of the distribution range of a marker or key species.

#### ***D.2.4. Element-Specific Differences***

The various climate elements (temperature, precipitation, cloudiness, snowfall, humidity, wind speed and direction, solar radiation) do not vary through time in the same sequence or manner nor should they necessarily be expected to vary in this manner. The spatial patterns of variability should not be expected to be the same for all elements. These patterns also should not be expected to be similar for all months or seasons. The suitability of individual sites for measurement also varies from one element to another. A site that has a favorable exposure for temperature or wind may not have a favorable exposure for precipitation or snowfall. A site that experiences proper air movement may be situated in a topographic channel, such as a river valley or a pass, which restricts the range of wind directions and affects the distribution of speed-direction categories.

#### ***D.2.5. Logistics and Practical Factors***

Even with the most advanced scientific rationale, sites in some remote or climatically challenging settings may not be suitable because of the difficulty in servicing and maintaining equipment. Contributing to these challenges are scheduling difficulties, animal behavior, snow burial, icing, snow behavior, access and logistical problems, and the weather itself. Remote and elevated sites usually require far more attention and expense than a rain-dominated, easily accessible valley location.

For climate purposes, station exposure and the local environment should be maintained in their original state (vegetation especially), so that changes seen are the result of regional climate variations and not of trees growing up, bushes crowding a site, surface albedo changing, fire clearing, etc. Repeat photography has shown many examples of slow environmental change in the vicinity of a station in rather short time frames (5–20 years), and this technique should be employed routinely and frequently at all locations. In the end, logistics, maintenance, and other practical factors almost always determine the success of weather- and climate-monitoring activities.

#### ***D.2.6. Personnel Factors***

Many past experiences (almost exclusively negative) strongly support the necessity to place primary responsibility for station deployment and maintenance in the hands of seasoned, highly qualified, trained, and meticulously careful personnel, the more experienced the better. Over

time, even in “benign” climates but especially where harsher conditions prevail, every conceivable problem will occur and both the usual and unusual should be anticipated: weather, animals, plants, salt, sensor and communication failure, windblown debris, corrosion, power failures, vibrations, avalanches, snow loading and creep, corruption of the data logger program, etc. An ability to anticipate and forestall such problems, a knack for innovation and improvisation, knowledge of electronics, practical and organizational skills, and presence of mind to bring the various small but vital parts, spares, tools, and diagnostic troubleshooting equipment are highly valued qualities. Especially when logistics are so expensive, a premium should be placed on using experienced personnel, since the slightest and seemingly most minor mistake can render a station useless or, even worse, uncertain. Exclusive reliance on individuals without this background can be costly and almost always will result eventually in unnecessary loss of data. Skilled labor and an apprenticeship system to develop new skilled labor will greatly reduce (but not eliminate) the types of problems that can occur in operating a climate network.

### **D.3. Site Selection**

In addition to considerations identified previously in this appendix, various factors need to be considered in selecting sites for new or augmented instrumentation.

#### ***D.3.1. Equipment and Exposure Factors***

D.3.1.1. Measurement Suite: All sites should measure temperature, humidity, wind, solar radiation, and snow depth. Precipitation measurements are more difficult but probably should be attempted with the understanding that winter measurements may be of limited or no value unless an all-weather gauge has been installed. Even if an all-weather gauge has been installed, it is desirable to have a second gauge present that operates on a different principle—for example, a fluid-based system like those used in the SNOTEL stations in tandem with a higher-resolution, tipping bucket gauge for summertime. Without heating, a tipping bucket gauge usually is of use only when temperatures are above freezing and when temperatures have not been below freezing for some time, so that accumulated ice and snow is not melting and being recorded as present precipitation. Gauge undercatch is a significant issue in snowy climates, so shielding should be considered for all gauges designed to work over the winter months. It is very important to note the presence or absence of shielding, the type of shielding, and the dates of installation or removal of the shielding.

D.3.1.2. Overall Exposure: The ideal, general all-purpose site has gentle slopes, is open to the sun and the wind, has a natural vegetative cover, avoids strong local (less than 200 m) influences, and represents a reasonable compromise among all climate elements. The best temperature sites are not the best precipitation sites, and the same is true for other elements. Steep topography in the immediate vicinity should be avoided unless settings where precipitation is affected by steep topography are being deliberately sought or a mountaintop or ridgeline is the desired location. The potential for disturbance should be considered: fire and flood risk, earth movement, wind-borne debris, volcanic deposits or lahars, vandalism, animal tampering, and general human encroachment are all factors.

D.3.1.3. Elevation: Mountain climates do not vary in time in exactly the same manner as adjoining valley climates. This concept is emphasized when temperature inversions are present to a greater degree and during precipitation when winds rise up the slopes at the same angle.

There is considerable concern that mountain climates will be (or already are) changing and perhaps changing differently than lowland climates, which has direct and indirect consequences for plant and animal life in the more extreme zones. Elevations of special significance are those that are near the mean rain/snow line for winter, near the tree line, and near the mean annual freezing level (all of these may not be quite the same). Because the lapse rates in wet climates often are nearly moist-adiabatic during the main precipitation seasons, measurements at one elevation may be extrapolated to nearby elevations. In drier climates and in the winter, temperature and to a lesser extent wind will show various elevation profiles.

D.3.1.4. **Transects:** The concept of observing transects that span climatic gradients is sound. This is not always straightforward in topographically uneven terrain, but these transects could still be arranged by setting up station(s) along the coast; in or near passes atop the main coastal interior drainage divide; and inland at one, two, or three distances into the interior lowlands. Transects need not—and by dint of topographic constraints probably cannot—be straight lines, but the closer that a line can be approximated the better. The main point is to systematically sample the key points of a behavioral transition without deviating too radically from linearity.

D.3.1.5. **Other Topographic Considerations:** There are various considerations with respect to local topography. Local topography can influence wind (channeling, upslope/downslope, etc.), precipitation (orographic enhancement, downslope evaporation, catch efficiency, etc.), and temperature (frost pockets, hilltops, aspect, mixing or decoupling from the overlying atmosphere, bowls, radiative effects, etc.), to different degrees at differing scales. In general, for measurements to be areally representative, it is better to avoid these local effects to the extent that they can be identified before station deployment (once deployed, it is desirable not to move a station). The primary purpose of a climate-monitoring network should be to serve as an infrastructure in the form of a set of benchmark stations for comparing other stations. Sometimes, however, it is exactly these local phenomena that we want to capture. Living organisms, especially plants, are affected by their immediate environment, whether it is representative of a larger setting or not. Specific measurements of limited scope and duration made for these purposes then can be tied to the main benchmarks. This experience is useful also in determining the complexity needed in the benchmark monitoring process in order to capture particular phenomena at particular space and time scales.

Sites that drain (cold air) well generally are better than sites that allow cold air to pool. Slightly sloped areas (1 degree is fine) or small benches from tens to hundreds of meters above streams are often favorable locations. Furthermore, these sites often tend to be out of the path of hazards (like floods) and to have rocky outcroppings where controlling vegetation will not be a major concern. Benches or wide spots on the rise between two forks of a river system are often the only flat areas and sometimes jut out to give greater exposure to winds from more directions.

D.3.1.6. **Prior History:** The starting point in designing a program is to determine what kinds of observations have been collected over time, by whom, in what manner, and if these observations are continuing to the present time. It also may be of value to “re-occupy” the former site of a station that is now inactive to provide some measure of continuity or a reference point from the past. This can be of value even if continuous observations were not made during the entire intervening period.

### **D.3.2. Element-Specific Factors**

D.3.2.1. Temperature: An open exposure with uninhibited air movement is the preferred setting. The most common measurement is made at approximately eye level, 1.5–2.0 m. In snowy locations sensors should be at least one meter higher than the deepest snowpack expected in the next 50 years or perhaps 2–3 times the depth of the average maximum annual depth. Sensors should be shielded above and below from solar radiation (bouncing off snow), from sunrise/sunset horizontal input, and from vertical rock faces. Sensors should be clamped tightly, so that they do not swivel away from level stacks of radiation plates. Nearby vegetation should be kept away from the sensors (several meters). Growing vegetation should be cut to original conditions. Small hollows and swales can cool tremendously at night, and it is best avoid these areas. Side slopes of perhaps a degree or two of angle facilitate air movement and drainage and, in effect, sample a large area during nighttime hours. The very bottom of a valley should be avoided. Temperature can change substantially from moves of only a few meters. Situations have been observed where flat and seemingly uniform conditions (like airport runways) appear to demonstrate different climate behaviors over short distances of a few tens or hundreds of meters (differences of 5–10°C). When snow is on the ground, these microclimatic differences can be stronger, and differences of 2–5°C can occur in the short distance between the thermometer and the snow surface on calm evenings.

D.3.2.2. Precipitation (liquid): Calm locations with vegetative or artificial shielding are preferred. Wind will adversely impact readings; therefore, the less the better. Wind effects on precipitation are far less for rain than for snow. Devices that “save” precipitation present advantages, but most gauges are built to dump precipitation as it falls or to empty periodically. Automated gauges give both the amount and the timing. Simple backups that record only the total precipitation since the last visit have a certain advantage (for example, storage gauges or lengths of PVC pipe perhaps with bladders on the bottom). The following question should be asked: Does the total precipitation from an automated gauge add up to the measured total in a simple bucket (evaporation is prevented with an appropriate substance such as mineral oil)? Drip from overhanging foliage and trees can augment precipitation totals.

D.3.2.3. Precipitation (frozen): Calm locations or shielding are a must. Undercatch for rain is only about 5 percent, but with winds of only 2–4 m/s, gauges may catch only 30–70 percent of the actual snow falling depending on density of the flakes. To catch 100 percent of the snow, the standard configuration for shielding is employed by the CRN (Climate Reference Network): the DFIR (Double-Fence Intercomparison Reference) shield with 2.4-m (8-ft.) vertical, wooden slatted fences in two concentric octagons with diameters of 8 m and 4 m (26 ft and 13 ft, respectively) and an inner Alter shield (flapping vanes). Numerous tests have shown this is the only way to achieve complete catch of snowfall (e.g., Yang et al. 1998; 2001). The DFIR shield is large and bulky; it is recommended that all precipitation gauges have at least Alter shields on them.

Near oceans, much snow is heavy and falls more vertically. In colder locations or storms, light flakes frequently will fly in and then out of the gauge. Clearings in forests are usually excellent sites. Snow blowing from trees that are too close can augment actual precipitation totals. Artificial shielding (vanes, etc.) placed around gauges in snowy locales always should be used if

accurate totals are desired. Moving parts tend to freeze up. Capping of gauges during heavy snowfall events is a common occurrence. When the cap becomes pointed, snow falls off to the ground and is not recorded. Caps and plugs often will not fall into the tube until hours, days, or even weeks have passed, typically during an extended period of freezing temperature or above or when sunlight finally occurs. Liquid-based measurements (e.g., SNOTEL “rocket” gauges) do not have the resolution (usually 0.3 cm [0.1 in.] rather than 0.03 cm [0.01 in.]) that tipping bucket and other gauges have but are known to be reasonably accurate in very snowy climates. Light snowfall events might not be recorded until enough of them add up to the next reporting increment. More expensive gauges like Geonors can be considered and could do quite well in snowy settings; however, they need to be emptied every 40 cm (15 in.) or so (capacity of 51 cm [20 in.]) until the new 91-cm (36-in.) capacity gauge is offered for sale. Recently, the NWS has been trying out the new (and very expensive) Ott all-weather gauge. Riming can be an issue in windy foggy environments below freezing. Rime, dew, and other forms of atmospheric condensation are not real precipitation, since they are caused by the gauge.

D.3.2.4. Snow Depth: Windswept areas tend to be blown clear of snow. Conversely, certain types of vegetation can act as a snow fence and cause artificial drifts. However, some amount of vegetation in the vicinity generally can help slow down the wind. The two most common types of snow-depth gauges are the Judd Snow Depth Sensor, produced by Judd Communications, and the snow depth gauge produced by Campbell Scientific, Inc. Opinions vary on which one is better. These gauges use ultrasound and look downward in a cone about 22 degrees in diameter. The ground should be relatively clear of vegetation and maintained in a manner so that the zero point on the calibration scale does not change.

D.3.2.5. Snow Water Equivalent: This is determined by the weight of snow on fluid-filled pads about the size of a desktop set up sometimes in groups of four or in larger hexagons several meters in diameter. These pads require flat ground some distance from nearby sources of windblown snow and shielding that is “just right”: not too close to the shielding to act as a kind of snow fence and not too far from the shielding so that blowing and drifting become a factor. Generally, these pads require fluids that possess antifreeze-like properties, as well as handling and replacement protocols.

D.3.2.6. Wind: Open exposures are needed for wind measurements. Small prominences or benches without blockage from certain sectors are preferred. A typical rule for trees is to site stations back 10 tree-heights from all tree obstructions. Sites in long, narrow valleys can obviously only exhibit two main wind directions. Gently rounded eminences are more favored. Any kind of topographic steering should be avoided to the extent possible. Avoiding major mountain chains or single isolated mountains or ridges is usually a favorable approach, if there is a choice. Sustained wind speed and the highest gusts (1-second) should be recorded. Averaging methodologies for both sustained winds and gusts can affect climate trends and should be recorded as metadata with all changes noted. Vegetation growth affects the vertical wind profile, and growth over a few years can lead to changes in mean wind speed even if the “real” wind does not change, so vegetation near the site (perhaps out to 50 m) should be maintained in a quasi-permanent status (same height and spatial distribution). Wind devices can rime up and freeze or spin out of balance. In severely rimed or windy climates, rugged anemometers, such as those made by Taylor, are worth considering. These anemometers are expensive but durable and

can withstand substantial abuse. In exposed locations, personnel should plan for winds to be at least 50 m/s and be able to measure these wind speeds. At a minimum, anemometers should be rated to 75 m/s.

D.3.2.7. Humidity: Humidity is a relatively straightforward climate element. Close proximity to lakes or other water features can affect readings. Humidity readings typically are less accurate near 100 percent and at low humidities in cold weather.

D.3.2.8. Solar Radiation: A site with an unobstructed horizon obviously is the most desirable. This generally implies a flat plateau or summit. However, in most locations trees or mountains will obstruct the sun for part of the day.

D.3.2.9. Soil Temperature: It is desirable to measure soil temperature at locations where soil is present. If soil temperature is recorded at only a single depth, the most preferred depth is 10 cm. Other common depths include 25 cm, 50 cm, 2 cm, and 100 cm. Biological activity in the soil will be proportional to temperature with important threshold effects occurring near freezing.

D.3.2.10. Soil Moisture: Soil-moisture gauges are somewhat temperamental and require care to install. The soil should be characterized by a soil expert during installation of the gauge. The readings may require a certain level of experience to interpret correctly. If accurate, readings of soil moisture are especially useful.

D.3.2.11. Distributed Observations: It can be seen readily that compromises must be struck among the considerations described in the preceding paragraphs because some are mutually exclusive.

How large can a “site” be? Generally, the equipment footprint should be kept as small as practical with all components placed next to each other (within less than 10–20 m or so). Readings from one instrument frequently are used to aid in interpreting readings from the remaining instruments.

What is a tolerable degree of separation? Some consideration may be given to locating a precipitation gauge or snow pillow among protective vegetation, while the associated temperature, wind, and humidity readings would be collected more effectively in an open and exposed location within 20–50 m. Ideally, it is advantageous to know the wind measurement precisely at the precipitation gauge, but a compromise involving a short split, and in effect a “distributed observation,” could be considered. There are no definitive rules governing this decision, but it is suggested that the site footprint be kept within approximately 50 m. There also are constraints imposed by engineering and electrical factors that affect cable lengths, signal strength, and line noise; therefore, the shorter the cable the better. Practical issues include the need to trench a channel to outlying instruments or to allow lines to lie atop the ground and associated problems with animals, humans, weathering, etc. Separating a precipitation gauge up to 100 m or so from an instrument mast may be an acceptable compromise if other factors are not limiting.

D.3.2.12. Instrument Replacement Schedules: Instruments slowly degrade, and a plan for replacing them with new, refurbished, or recalibrated instruments should be in place. After approximately five years, a systematic change-out procedure should result in replacing most sensors in a network. Certain parts, such as solar radiation sensors, are candidates for annual calibration or change-out. Anemometers tend to degrade as bearings erode or electrical contacts become uneven. Noisy bearings are an indication, and a stethoscope might aid in hearing such noises. Increased internal friction affects the threshold starting speed; once spinning, they tend to function properly. Increases in starting threshold speeds can lead to more zero-wind measurements and thus reduce the reported mean wind speed with no real change in wind properties. A field calibration kit should be developed and taken on all site visits, routine or otherwise. Rain gauges can be tested with drip testers during field visits. Protective conduit and tight water seals can prevent abrasion and moisture problems with the equipment, although seals can keep moisture in as well as out. Bulletproof casings sometimes are employed in remote settings. A supply of spare parts, at least one of each and more for less-expensive or more-delicate sensors, should be maintained to allow replacement of worn or nonfunctional instruments during field visits. In addition, this approach allows instruments to be calibrated in the relative convenience of the operational home—the larger the network, the greater the need for a parts depot.

### ***D.3.3. Long-Term Comparability and Consistency***

D.3.3.1. Consistency: The emphasis here is to hold biases constant. Every site has biases, problems, and idiosyncrasies of one sort or another. The best rule to follow is simply to try to keep biases constant through time. Since the goal is to track climate through time, keeping sensors, methodologies, and exposure constant will ensure that only true climate change is being measured. This means leaving the site in its original state or performing maintenance to keep it that way. Once a site is installed, the goal should be to never move the site even by a few meters or to allow significant changes to occur within 100 m for the next several decades.

Sites in or near rock outcroppings likely will experience less vegetative disturbance or growth through the years and will not usually retain moisture, a factor that could speed corrosion. Sites that will remain locally similar for some time are usually preferable. However, in some cases the intent of a station might be to record the local climate effects of changes within a small-scale system (for example, glacier, recently burned area, or scene of some other disturbance) that is subject to a regional climate influence. In this example, the local changes might be much larger than the regional changes.

D.3.3.2. Metadata: Since the climate of every site is affected by features in the immediate vicinity, it is vital to record this information over time and to update the record repeatedly at each service visit. Distances, angles, heights of vegetation, fine-scale topography, condition of instruments, shielding discoloration, and other factors from within a meter to several kilometers should be noted. Systematic photography should be undertaken and updated at least once every one–two years.

Photographic documentation should be taken at each site in a standard manner and repeated every two–three years. Guidelines for methodology were developed by Redmond (2004) as a

result of experience with the NOAA CRN and can be found on the WRCC NPS Web pages at <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/nps> and at <ftp://ftp.wrcc.dri.edu/nps/photodocumentation.pdf>.

The main purpose for climate stations is to *track climatic conditions through time*. Anything that affects the interpretation of records through time must be noted and recorded for posterity. The important factors should be clear to a person who has never visited the site, no matter how long ago the site was installed.

In regions with significant, climatic transition zones, transects are an efficient way to span several climates and make use of available resources. Discussions on this topic at greater detail can be found in Redmond and Simeral (2004) and in Redmond et al. (2005).

#### **D.4. Literature Cited**

American Association of State Climatologists. 1985. Heights and exposure standards for sensors on automated weather stations. *The State Climatologist* **9**.

Brock, F. V., K. C. Crawford, R. L. Elliott, G. W. Cuperus, S. J. Stadler, H. L. Johnson and M. D. Eilts. 1995. The Oklahoma Mesonet: A technical overview. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology* **12**:5-19.

Daly, C., R. P. Neilson, and D. L. Phillips. 1994. A statistical-topographic model for mapping climatological precipitation over mountainous terrain. *Journal of Applied Meteorology* **33**:140-158.

Daly, C., W. P. Gibson, G. H. Taylor, G. L. Johnson, and P. Pasteris. 2002. A knowledge-based approach to the statistical mapping of climate. *Climate Research* **22**:99-113.

Doggett, M., C. Daly, J. Smith, W. Gibson, G. Taylor, G. Johnson, and P. Pasteris. 2004. High-resolution 1971-2000 mean monthly temperature maps for the western United States. Fourteenth AMS Conf. on Applied Climatology, 84<sup>th</sup> AMS Annual Meeting. Seattle, WA, American Meteorological Society, Boston, MA, January 2004, Paper 4.3, CD-ROM.

Geiger, R., R. H. Aron, and P. E. Todhunter. 2003. *The Climate Near the Ground*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., New York.

Gibson, W. P., C. Daly, T. Kittel, D. Nychka, C. Johns, N. Rosenbloom, A. McNab, and G. Taylor. 2002. Development of a 103-year high-resolution climate data set for the conterminous United States. Thirteenth AMS Conf. on Applied Climatology. Portland, OR, American Meteorological Society, Boston, MA, May 2002:181-183.

Goodison, B. E., P. Y. T. Louie, and D. Yang. 1998. WMO solid precipitation measurement intercomparison final report. WMO TD 982, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

- National Research Council. 1998. Future of the National Weather Service Cooperative Weather Network. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.
- National Research Council. 2001. A Climate Services Vision: First Steps Toward the Future. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.
- Redmond, K. T. 1992. Effects of observation time on interpretation of climatic time series - A need for consistency. Eighth Annual Pacific Climate (PACLIM) Workshop. Pacific Grove, CA, March 1991:141-150.
- Redmond, K. T. 2004. Photographic documentation of long-term climate stations. Available from <ftp://ftp.wrcc.dri.edu/nps/photodocumentation.pdf>. (accessed 15 August 2004)
- Redmond, K. T. and D. B. Simeral. 2004. Climate monitoring comments: Central Alaska Network Inventory and Monitoring Program. Available from <ftp://ftp.wrcc.dri.edu/nps/alaska/cakn/npscakncomments040406.pdf>. (accessed 6 April 2004)
- Redmond, K. T., D. B. Simeral, and G. D. McCurdy. 2005. Climate monitoring for southwest Alaska national parks: network design and site selection. Report 05-01. Western Regional Climate Center, Reno, Nevada.
- Redmond, K. T., and G. D. McCurdy. 2005. Channel Islands National Park: Design considerations for weather and climate monitoring. Report 05-02. Western Regional Climate Center, Reno, Nevada.
- Sevruk, B., and W. R. Hamon. 1984. International comparison of national precipitation gauges with a reference pit gauge. Instruments and Observing Methods, Report No 17, WMO/TD – 38, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Simpson, J. J., Hufford, G. L., C. Daly, J. S. Berg, and M. D. Fleming. 2005. Comparing maps of mean monthly surface temperature and precipitation for Alaska and adjacent areas of Canada produced by two different methods. Arctic **58**:137-161.
- Whiteman, C. D. 2000. Mountain Meteorology: Fundamentals and Applications. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Wilson, E. O. 1998. Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge. Knopf, New York.
- World Meteorological Organization. 1983. Guide to meteorological instruments and methods of observation, No. 8, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva Switzerland.
- World Meteorological Organization. 2005. Organization and planning of intercomparisons of rainfall intensity gauges. World Meteorological Organization, Geneva Switzerland.
- Yang, D., B. E. Goodison, J. R. Metcalfe, V. S. Golubev, R. Bates, T. Pangburn, and C. Hanson. 1998. Accuracy of NWS 8” standard nonrecording precipitation gauge: results and

application of WMO intercomparison. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology* **15**:54-68.

Yang, D., B. E. Goodison, J. R. Metcalfe, P. Louie, E. Elomaa, C. Hanson, V. Bolubey, T. Gunther, J. Milkovic, and M. Lapin. 2001. Compatibility evaluation of national precipitation gauge measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **106**:1481-1491.

## Appendix E. Master metadata field list

Field Name	Field Type	Field Description
<b>begin_date</b>	date	Effective beginning date for a record.
<b>begin_date_flag</b>	char(2)	Flag describing the known accuracy of the begin date for a station.
<b>best_elevation</b>	float(4)	Best known elevation for a station (in feet).
<b>clim_div_code</b>	char(2)	Foreign key defining climate division code (primary in table: clim_div).
<b>clim_div_key</b>	int2	Foreign key defining climate division for a station (primary in table: clim_div).
<b>clim_div_name</b>	varchar(30)	English name for a climate division.
<b>controller_info</b>	varchar(50)	Person or organization who maintains the identifier system for a given weather or climate network.
<b>country_key</b>	int2	Foreign key defining country where a station resides (primary in table: none).
<b>county_key</b>	int2	Foreign key defining county where a station resides (primary in table: county).
<b>county_name</b>	varchar(31)	English name for a county.
<b>description</b>	text	Any description pertaining to the particular table.
<b>end_date</b>	date	Last effective date for a record.
<b>end_date_flag</b>	char(2)	Flag describing the known accuracy of station end date.
<b>fips_country_code</b>	char(2)	FIPS (federal information processing standards) country code.
<b>fips_state_abbr</b>	char(2)	FIPS state abbreviation for a station.
<b>fips_state_code</b>	char(2)	FIPS state code for a station.
<b>history_flag</b>	char(2)	Describes temporal significance of an individual record among others from the same station.
<b>id_type_key</b>	int2	Foreign key defining the id_type for a station (usually defined in code).
<b>last_updated</b>	date	Date of last update for a record.
<b>latitude</b>	float(8)	Latitude value.
<b>longitude</b>	float(8)	Longitude value.
<b>name_type_key</b>	int2	“3”: COOP station name, “2”: best station name.
<b>name</b>	varchar(30)	Station name as known at date of last update entry.
<b>ncdc_state_code</b>	char(2)	NCDC, two-character code identifying U.S. state.
<b>network_code</b>	char(8)	Eight-character abbreviation code identifying a network.
<b>network_key</b>	int2	Foreign key defining the network for a station (primary in table: network).
<b>network_station_id</b>	int4	Identifier for a station in the associated network, which is defined by id_type_key.
<b>remark</b>	varchar(254)	Additional information for a record.
<b>src_quality_code</b>	char(2)	Code describing the data quality for the data source.
<b>state_key</b>	int2	Foreign key defining the U.S. state where a station resides (primary in table: state).
<b>state_name</b>	varchar(30)	English name for a state.
<b>station_alt_name</b>	varchar(30)	Other English names for a station.
<b>station_best_name</b>	varchar(30)	Best, most well-known English name for a station.
<b>time_zone</b>	float4	Time zone where a station resides.
<b>ucan_station_id</b>	int4	Unique station identifier for every station in ACIS.
<b>unit_key</b>	int2	Integer value representing a unit of measure.

<b>Field Name</b>	<b>Field Type</b>	<b>Field Description</b>
<b>updated_by</b>	char(8)	Person who last updated a record.
<b>var_major_id</b>	int2	Defines major climate variable.
<b>var_minor_id</b>	int2	Defines data source within a var_major_id.
<b>zipcode</b>	char(5)	Zipcode where a latitude/longitude point resides.
<b>nps_netcode</b>	char(4)	Network four-character identifier.
<b>nps_netname</b>	varchar(128)	Displayed English name for a network.
<b>parkcode</b>	char(4)	Park four-character identifier.
<b>parkname</b>	varchar(128)	Displayed English name for a park/
<b>im_network</b>	char(4)	NPS I&M network where park belongs (a net code)/
<b>station_id</b>	varchar(16)	Station identifier.
<b>station_id_type</b>	varchar(16)	Type of station identifier.
<b>network.subnetwork.id</b>	varchar(16)	Identifier of a sub-network in associated network.
<b>subnetwork_key</b>	int2	Foreign key defining sub-network for a station.
<b>subnetwork_name</b>	varchar(30)	English name for a sub-network.
<b>slope</b>	integer	Terrain slope at the location.
<b>aspect</b>	integer	Terrain aspect at the station.
<b>gps</b>	char(1)	Indicator of latitude/longitude recorded via GPS (Global Positioning System).
<b>site_description</b>	text(0)	Physical description of site.
<b>route_directions</b>	text(0)	Driving route or site access directions.
<b>station_photo_id</b>	integer	Unique identifier associating a group of photos to a station. Group of photos all taken on same date.
<b>photo_id</b>	char(30)	Unique identifier for a photo.
<b>photo_date</b>	datetime	Date photograph taken.
<b>photographer</b>	varchar(64)	Name of photographer.
<b>maintenance_date</b>	datetime	Date of station maintenance visit.
<b>contact_key</b>	Integer	Unique identifier associating contact information to a station.
<b>full_name</b>	varchar(64)	Full name of contact person.
<b>organization</b>	varchar(64)	Organization of contact person.
<b>contact_type</b>	varchar(32)	Type of contact person (operator, administrator, etc.)
<b>position_title</b>	varchar(32)	Title of contact person.
<b>address</b>	varchar(32)	Address for contact person.
<b>city</b>	varchar(32)	City for contact person.
<b>state</b>	varchar(2)	State for contact person.
<b>zip_code</b>	char(10)	Zipcode for contact person.
<b>country</b>	varchar(32)	Country for contact person.
<b>email</b>	varchar(64)	E-mail for contact person.
<b>work_phone</b>	varchar(16)	Work phone for contact person.
<b>contact_notes</b>	text(254)	Other details regarding contact person.
<b>equipment_type</b>	char(30)	Sensor measurement type; i.e., wind speed, air temperature, etc.
<b>eq_manufacturer</b>	char(30)	Manufacturer of equipment.
<b>eq_model</b>	char(20)	Model number of equipment.
<b>serial_num</b>	char(20)	Serial number of equipment.
<b>eq_description</b>	varchar(254)	Description of equipment.
<b>install_date</b>	datetime	Installation date of equipment.
<b>remove_date</b>	datetime	Removal date of equipment.
<b>ref_height</b>	integer	Sensor displacement height from surface.
<b>sampling_interval</b>	varchar(10)	Frequency of sensor measurement.

## Appendix F. Electronic supplements

**F.1. ACIS metadata file** for weather and climate stations associated with the SWAN:  
[http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/nps/pub/SWAN/metadata/SWAN\\_from\\_ACIS.tar.gz](http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/nps/pub/SWAN/metadata/SWAN_from_ACIS.tar.gz).

# Appendix G. Descriptions of weather/climate monitoring networks

## G.1. NWS Cooperative Observer Program (COOP)

- Purpose of network:
  - Provide observational, meteorological data required to define U.S. climate and help measure long-term climate changes.
  - Provide observational, meteorological data in near real-time to support forecasting and warning mechanisms and other public service programs of the NWS.
- Primary management agency: NOAA (NWS).
- Data website: data are available from the NCDC (<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov>), RCCs (e.g., WRCC, <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu>), and state climate offices.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Maximum, minimum, and observation-time temperature.
  - Precipitation, snowfall, snow depth.
  - Pan evaporation (some stations).
- Sampling frequency: daily.
- Reporting frequency: daily or monthly (station-dependent).
- Estimated station cost: \$2000 with maintenance costs of \$500–900/year.
- Network strengths:
  - Decade–century records at most sites.
  - Widespread national coverage (thousands of stations).
  - Excellent data quality when well-maintained.
  - Relatively inexpensive; highly cost effective.
  - Manual measurements; not automated.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Uneven exposures; many are not well-maintained.
  - Dependence on schedules for volunteer observers.
  - Slow entry of data from many stations into national archives.
  - Data subject to observational methodology; not always documented.
  - Manual measurements; not automated and not hourly.

The COOP network has long served as the main climate observation network in the U.S. Readings are usually made by volunteers using equipment supplied, installed, and maintained by the federal government. The observer in effect acts as a host for the data-gathering activities and supplies the labor; this is truly a “cooperative” effort. The SAO sites often are considered to be part of the cooperative network as well if they collect the previously mentioned types of weather and climate observations. Typical observation days are morning to morning, evening to evening, or midnight to midnight. By convention, observations are ascribed to the date the instrument was reset at the end of the observational period. For this reason, midnight observations represent the end of a day. The Historical Climate Network is a subset of the COOP network but contains longer and more complete records.

## **G.2. Citizen Weather Observer Program (CWOP)**

- Purpose of network: collect observations from private citizens and make these data available for homeland security and other weather applications, providing constant feedback to the observers to maintain high data quality.
- Primary management agency: NOAA MADIS program.
- Data Website: <http://www.wxqa.com>.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Dewpoint temperature.
  - Precipitation.
  - Wind speed and direction.
  - Barometric pressure.
- Sampling frequency: 15 minutes or less.
- Reporting frequency: 15 minutes.
- Estimated station cost: unknown.
- Network strengths:
  - Active partnership between public agencies and private citizens.
  - Large number of participant sites.
  - Regular communications between data providers and users, encouraging higher data quality.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Variable instrumentation platforms.
  - Metadata are sometimes limited.

The CWOP network is a public-private partnership with U.S. citizens and various agencies including NOAA, NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration), and various universities. There are over 4500 registered sites worldwide, with close to 3000 of these sites located in North America.

## **G.3. USDA/NRCS Snowcourse Network (NRCS-SC)**

- Purpose of network: collect snowpack and related climate data to assist in forecasting water supply in the western U.S.
- Primary management agency: NRCS.
- Data website: <http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/snowcourse/>.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Snow depth.
  - Snow water equivalent.
- Sampling, reporting frequency: monthly or seasonally.
- Estimated station cost: cost of man-hours needed to set up snowcourse and make measurements.
- Network strengths:
  - Periods of record are generally long.
  - Large number of high-altitude sites.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Measurement and reporting only occurs on monthly to seasonal basis.

- Few weather/climate elements are measured.

USDA/NRCS maintains a network of snow-monitoring stations known as snowcourses. Many of these sites have been in operation since the early part of the twentieth century. These are all manual sites where only snow depth and snow water content are measured.

#### **G.4. Remote Automated Weather Station (RAWS) Network**

- Purpose of network: provide near-real-time (hourly or near hourly) measurements of meteorological variables for use in fire weather forecasts and climatology. Data from RAWS also are used for natural resource management, flood forecasting, natural hazard management, and air-quality monitoring.
- Primary management agency: WRCC, National Interagency Fire Center.
- Data website: <http://www.raws.dri.edu/index.html>.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Precipitation.
  - Relative humidity.
  - Wind speed.
  - Wind direction.
  - Wind gust.
  - Gust direction.
  - Solar radiation.
  - Soil moisture and temperature.
- Sampling frequency: 1 or 10 minutes, element-dependent.
- Reporting frequency: generally hourly. Some stations report every 15 or 30 minutes.
- Estimated station cost: \$12000 with satellite telemetry (\$8000 without satellite telemetry); maintenance costs are around \$2000/year.
- Network strengths:
  - Metadata records are usually complete.
  - Sites are located in remote areas.
  - Sites are generally well-maintained.
  - Entire period of record available on-line.
- Network weaknesses:
  - RAWS network is focused largely on fire management needs (formerly focused only on fire needs).
  - Frozen precipitation is not measured reliably.
  - Station operation is not always continuous.
  - Data transmission is completed via one-way telemetry. Data are therefore recoverable either in real-time or not at all.

The RAWS network is used by many land-management agencies, such as the BLM, NPS, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Forest Service, and other agencies. The RAWS network was one of the first automated weather station networks to be installed in the U.S. Most gauges do not have heaters, so hydrologic measurements are of little value when temperatures dip below freezing or reach freezing after frozen precipitation events. There are approximately

1100 real-time sites in this network and about 1800 historic sites (some are decommissioned or moved). The sites can transmit data all winter but may be in deep snow in some locations. The WRCC is the archive for this network and receives station data and metadata through a special connection to the National Interagency Fire Center in Boise, Idaho.

### **G.5. NWS/FAA Surface Airways Observation Network (SAO)**

- Purpose of network: provide near-real-time (hourly or near hourly) measurements of meteorological variables and are used both for airport operations and weather forecasting.
- Primary management agency: NOAA, FAA.
- Data website: data are available from state climate offices, RCCs (e.g., WRCC, <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu>), and NCDC (<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov>).
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Dewpoint and/or relative humidity.
  - Wind speed.
  - Wind direction.
  - Wind gust.
  - Gust direction.
  - Barometric pressure.
  - Precipitation (not at many FAA sites).
  - Sky cover.
  - Ceiling (cloud height).
  - Visibility.
- Sampling frequency: element-dependent.
- Reporting frequency: element-dependent.
- Estimated station cost: \$100000–\$200000, with maintenance costs approximately \$10000/year.
- Network strengths:
  - Records generally extend over several decades.
  - Consistent maintenance and station operations.
  - Data record is reasonably complete and usually high quality.
  - Hourly or sub-hourly data.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Nearly all sites are located at airports.
  - Data quality can be related to size of airport—smaller airports tend to have poorer datasets.
  - Influences from urbanization and other land-use changes.

These stations are managed by NOAA, U. S. Navy, U. S. Air Force, and FAA. These stations are located generally at major airports and military bases. The FAA stations often do not record precipitation, or they may provide precipitation records of reduced quality. Automated stations are typically ASOSs for the NWS or AWOSs for the FAA. Some sites only report episodically with observers paid per observation.

## **G.6. USDA/NRCS Soil Climate Analysis Network (SCAN)**

- Purpose of network: comprehensive soil-climate network used in natural resource assessments and other conservation activities in the U.S.
- Primary management agency: USDA/NRCS.
- Data website: <http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/scan/>.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Precipitation.
  - Relative humidity.
  - Wind speed.
  - Wind direction.
  - Barometric pressure.
  - Solar radiation.
  - Snow water content.
  - Snow depth.
  - Soil moisture and temperature (enhanced sites only).
- Sampling frequency: 1-minute temperature; 1-hour precipitation, snow water content, and snow depth. Less than one minute for relative humidity, wind speed and direction, solar radiation, and soil moisture and temperature (all at enhanced site configurations only).
- Reporting frequency: reporting intervals are user-selectable. Commonly used intervals are every one, two, three, or six hours.
- Estimated station cost: \$25000, with maintenance costs approximately \$1000/year.
- Network strengths:
  - Sites are well-maintained.
  - Data are of high quality and are largely complete.
  - Very reliable automated system.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Short data records.
  - Network is still in development.

The SCAN network is intended to be a comprehensive nationwide soil moisture and climate information system to be used in supporting natural resource assessments and other conservation activities. These stations are usually located in the agricultural areas of the U.S. All SCAN sites are automated.

## **G.7. USDA/NRCS Snowfall Telemetry (SNOTEL) network**

- Purpose of network: collect snowpack and related climate data to assist in forecasting water supply in the western U.S.
- Primary management agency: NRCS.
- Data website: <http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/snow/>.
- Measured weather/climate elements:
  - Air temperature.
  - Precipitation.
  - Snow water content.
  - Snow depth.

- Relative humidity (enhanced sites only).
- Wind speed (enhanced sites only).
- Wind direction (enhanced sites only).
- Solar radiation (enhanced sites only).
- Soil moisture and temperature (enhanced sites only).
- Sampling frequency: 1-minute temperature; 1-hour precipitation, snow water content, and snow depth. Less than one minute for relative humidity, wind speed and direction, solar radiation, and soil moisture and temperature (all at enhanced site configurations only).
- Reporting frequency: reporting intervals are user-selectable. Commonly used intervals are every one, two, three, or six hours.
- Estimated station cost: \$20000 with maintenance costs approximately \$2000/year.
- Network strengths:
  - Sites are located in high-altitude areas that typically do not have other weather or climate stations.
  - Data are of high quality and are largely complete.
  - Very reliable automated system.
- Network weaknesses:
  - Historically limited number of elements measured.
  - Remote so data gaps can be long.
  - Metadata sparse and not high quality; site histories are lacking.
  - Measurement and reporting frequencies vary.
  - Many hundreds of mountain ranges still not sampled.
  - Earliest stations were installed in the late 1970s; temperatures have only been recorded since the 1980s.

USDA/NRCS maintains a set of automated snow-monitoring stations known as the SNOTEL (snowfall telemetry) network. These stations are designed specifically for cold and snowy locations. Precipitation and snow water content measurements are intended for hydrologic applications and water-supply forecasting, so these measurements are measured generally to within 2.5 mm (0.1 in.). Snow depth is tracked to the nearest 25 mm, or one inch. These stations function year around.

The U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) is the nation's principal conservation agency, charged with the mission "*to protect and provide access to our Nation's natural and cultural heritage and honor our trust responsibilities to Indian tribes and our commitments to island communities.*" More specifically, DOI protects America's treasures for future generations, provides access to our Nation's natural and cultural heritage, offers recreational opportunities, honors its trust responsibilities to American Indians and Alaskan Natives and its responsibilities to island communities, conducts scientific research, provides wise stewardship of energy and mineral resources, fosters sound use of land and water resources, and conserves and protects fish and wildlife. The work that we do affects the lives of millions of people; from the family taking a vacation in one of our national parks to the children studying in one of our Indian schools.

**National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior**

**Natural Resource Program Center  
Fort Collins, Colorado**

---



**Natural Resource Program Center  
1201 Oakridge Drive, Suite 150  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80525**

[www.nps.gov](http://www.nps.gov)